arXiv:1603.08142v1 [q-fin.EC] 26 Mar 2016

Conjoint axiomatization of the Choquet integral for heterogeneous product sets

Mikhail Timonin

March 29, 2016

Abstract

We propose an axiomatization of the Choquet integral model for the general case of a heterogeneous product set $X = X_1 \times \ldots \times X_n$. In MCDA elements of X are interpreted as alternatives, characterized by criteria taking values from the sets X_i. Previous axiomatizations of the Choquet integral have been given for particular cases $X = Y^n$ and $X = \mathbb{R}^n$. However, within multicriteria context such identicalness, hence commensurateness, of criteria cannot be assumed a priori. This constitutes the major difference of this paper from the earlier axiomatizations. In particular, the notion of "comonotonicity" cannot be used in a heterogeneous structure, as there does not exist a "built-in" order between elements of sets X_i and X_j. However, such an order is implied by the representation model. Our approach does not assume commensurateness of criteria. We construct the representation and study its uniqueness properties.

1 Introduction

The Choquet integral is widely used in decision analysis and, in particular, MCDA Grabisch and Labreuche [2008], although its use is still somewhat restricted due to both methodological problems and difficulties in practical implementation. Rank-dependent models first appeared in the axiomatic decision theory in reply to the criticism of Savage's postulates of rationality Savage [1954]. The renowned Ellsberg paradox Ellsberg [1961] has shown that people can violate Savage's axioms and still consider their behaviour rational. First models accounting for the so-called uncertainty aversion observed in this paradox appeared in the 1980s, in the work Quiggin [1982] and others (see Wakker [1991b] for a review). One particular generalization of the expected utility model (EU) characterized by Schmeidler Schmeidler [1989] is the Choquet expected utility (CEU), where probability is replaced by a non-additive set function (called capacity) and integration is performed using the Choquet integral.

Since Schmeidler's paper, various versions of the same model have been characterized in the literature (e.g. Gilboa [1987], Wakker [1991a]). CEU has gained some momentum in both theoretical and applied economic literature, being used mainly for analysis of problems involving Knightian uncertainty. At the same time, rank-dependent models, in particular the Choquet integral, were adopted in multiattribute utility theory (MAUT)

Keeney and Raiffa [1976]. Here the integral gained popularity due to the tractability of non-additive measures in this context (see Grabisch and Labreuche [2008] for a review). The model permitted various preferential phenomena, such as criteria interaction, which were impossible to reflect in the traditional additive models.

The connection between MAUT and decision making under uncertainty has been known for a long time. In the case when the number of states is finite, which is assumed hereafter, states can be associated with criteria. Accordingly, acts correspond to multicriteria alternatives. Finally, the sets of outcomes at each state can be associated with the sets of criteria values. However, this last transition is not quite trivial. It is commonly assumed that the set of outcomes is the same in each state of the world Savage [1954], Schmeidler [1989]. In multicriteria decision making the opposite is true. Indeed, consider preferences of consumers choosing cars. Each car is characterized by a number of features (criteria), such as colour, maximal speed, fuel consumption, comfort, etc. Apparently, sets of values taken by each criterion can be completely different from those of the others. In such context the ranking stage of rank-dependent models, which in decision under uncertainty involves comparing outcomes attained at various states, would amount to comparing colours to the level of fuel consumption, and maximal speed to comfort. Indeed, the traditional additive model Debreu [1959], Krantz et al. [1971] only implies meaningful comparability of units between goods in the bundle, but not of their absolute levels. However, in rank-dependent models such comparability seems to be a necessary condition.

We propose a representation theorem for the Choquet integral model in the MCDA context. Binary relation $\succcurlyeq$ is defined on a heterogeneous product set $X = X_1 \times \ldots \times X_n$. In multicriteria decision analysis (MCDA), elements of the set X are interpreted as alternatives, characterized by criteria taking values from sets X_i. Previous axiomatizations of the Choquet integral model have been given for the special cases of $X = Y^n$ (see Köbberling and Wakker [2003] for a review of approaches) and $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ (see Grabisch and Labreuche [2008] for a review). One related result is the recent axiomatization of the Sugeno integral model (Greco et al. [2004], Bouyssou et al. [2009]). Another approach using conditions on the utility functions was proposed in Labreuche [2012]. The "conjoint" axiomatization of the Choquet integral for the case of a general X was an open problem in the literature. The crucial difference with the previous axiomatizations is that the notion of "comonotonicity" cannot be used in the heterogeneous case, due to the fact that there does not exist a meaningful "built-in" order between elements of sets X_i. New axioms and modifications of proof techniques had to be introduced to account for that.

Our first axiom shows, roughly, how the set X can be partitioned into subsets based on properties necessary for existence of an additive representation. The axiom (**A3**) we introduce is similar to the "2-graded" condition previously used for characterizing of MIN/MAX and the Sugeno integral (Greco et al. [2004], Bouyssou et al. [2009]). At every point $z \in X$ for every pair of coordinates $i, j \in N$ it is possible to build two "rectangular cones" - one made up of points from X_i which are "greater" than z_i and points from X_j which are "less" than z_j, and the second for the opposite case. The axiom states that triple cancellation for $\succcurlyeq$ restricted to i, j must then hold on at least one of these cones. This allows to partition X into subsets by using intersection of such cones for various pairs i, j.

The second property is that the additive representations on different subsets are inter-

related, in particular "trade-offs" between criteria values are consistent across partition elements both within the same dimension and across different ones. This is reflected by two axioms (**A4, A5**), similar to the ones used in Wakker [1991a] and Krantz et al. [1971] (section 8.2). One, roughly speaking, states that triple cancellation holds across subsets, while the other says that ordering of intervals on any dimension must be preserved when they are projected onto another dimension by means of equivalence relations. These axioms are complemented by a new condition called bi-independence (**A6**) and weak separability (**A2**) Bouyssou et al. [2009] - which together reflect the monotonicity property of the integral, and also the standard essentiality, "comonotonic" Archimedean axiom and restricted solvability (**A7,A8,A9**). Finally, $\succcurlyeq$ is supposed to be a weak order (**A1**), and X is order dense.

2 Choquet integral in MCDA

Definition 1. *Let $N = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ be a finite set and 2^N its power set. Capacity (non-additive measure, fuzzy measure) is a set function $\nu : 2^N \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that:*

1. $\nu(\varnothing) = 0$;
2. $A \subseteq B \Rightarrow \nu(A) \leq \nu(B),\ \forall A, B \in 2^N$.

In this paper, it is also assumed that capacities are normalized, i.e. $\nu(N) = 1$.

Definition 2. *The Choquet integral of a function $f : N \to \mathbb{R}$ with respect to a capacity ν is defined as*

$$C(\nu, f) = \int_0^\infty \nu(\{i \in N \colon f(i) \geq r\})dr + \int_{-\infty}^0 [\nu(\{i \in N \colon f(i) \geq r\}) - 1]dr$$

Denoting the range of $f : N \to \mathbb{R}$ as $\{f_1, \ldots, f_n\}$, the definition can be written down as:

$$C(\nu, (f_1, \ldots, f_n)) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (f_{(i)} - f_{(i-1)})\nu(\{j \in N \colon f_j \geq f_{(i)}\})$$

where $f_{(1)}, \ldots, f_{(n)}$ is a permutation of $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ such that $f_{(1)} \leq f_{(2)} \leq \cdots \leq f_{(n)}$, and $f_{(0)} = 0$.

On of the most useful tools for analysis of the capacity is the so-called Möbius transform. It's a linear transformation of the capacity which is given by:

$$m(A) = \sum_{B \subset A} (-1)^{|A \setminus B|} \nu(B).$$

The Choquet integral can be written in a very convenient form using the Möbius transform coefficients:

$$C(\nu, f) = \sum_{A \in N} m(A) \min_{i \in A}(f_i).$$

2.1 The model

Let $\succcurlyeq$ be a binary relation on the set $X = X_1 \times \ldots \times X_n$. $\succ, \prec, \preccurlyeq, \sim, \not\sim$ are defined in the usual way. In MCDA, elements of set X are interpreted as alternatives characterized by criteria from the set $N = \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Set X_i contains criteria values for criterion i. We say that $\succcurlyeq$ can be represented by a Choquet integral, if there exists a capacity ν and functions $f_i : X_i \to \mathbb{R}$, called value functions, such that:

$$x \succcurlyeq y \iff C(\nu, (f_1(x_1), \ldots, f_n(x_n)) \geq C(\nu, (f_1(y_1), \ldots, f_n(y_n)).$$

As seen in the definition of the Choquet integral, its calculation involves comparison of f_i's to each other. It is not immediately obvious how this operation can have any meaning in the MCDA decision framework. It is well-known that direct comparison of value functions for various attributes is meaningless in the additive model Krantz et al. [1971] (recall that the origin of each value function can be changed independently). In the homogeneous case $X = Y^n$ this problem is readily solved, as we have a single set of "consequences" Y (in the context of decision making under uncertainty). The required order is either assumed as given Wakker [1991b] or is readily derived from the ordering of "constant" acts $(y, \ldots, y)$ Wakker [1991a]. Since there is a single "consequence" set, we also only have one value function $U : Y \to \mathbb{R}$, and thus comparing $U(y_i)$ to $U(y_j)$ is perfectly sensible, since U represents the order on the set Y. None of these methods can be readily applied in the heterogeneous case.

2.2 Properties of the Choquet integral

Below are given some important properties of the Choquet integral:

1. Functions $f : N \to \mathbb{R}$ and $g : N \to \mathbb{R}$ are comonotonic if for no $i, j \in N$ holds $f(i) > f(j)$ and $g(i) < g(j)$. For all comonotonic f the Choquet integral reduces to a usual Lebesgue integral. In the finite case, the integral is accordingly reduced to a weighted sum.

2. Particular cases of the Choquet integral (e.g. Grabisch and Labreuche [2008]).

   - If $m(\{1\}) = \ldots = m(\{n\}) = 1$, then $C(\nu, (f_1, \ldots, f_n)) = \max(f_1, \ldots, f_n)$.
   - If $m(N) = 1, m(A) = 0, A \neq N$, then $C(\nu, (f_1, \ldots, f_n)) = \min(f_1, \ldots, f_n)$.
   - If $m(A) = 0$, for all $A \subset N : |A| \geq 2$, then $C(\nu, (f_1, \ldots, f_n)) = \sum_{i \in N} \nu(\{i\}) f_i$

Property 1 states that the set X can be partitioned into subsets corresponding to particular ordering of the value functions. There are $n!$ such sets. Since the integral on each of the sets is reduced to a weighted sum, i.e. an additive representation, we should expect many of the axioms of the additive conjoint model to be valid on this subsets. This is the intuition behind several of the axioms given in the following section.

3 Axioms and definitions

Definition 3. *Given $i, j \in N$, a relation $\succcurlyeq$ on $X_1 \times \ldots \times X_n$ satisfies ij-*triple cancellation (**ij-3C**)*, if for all $a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i \in X_i$, $p_j, q_j, r_j, s_j \in X_j$, and all $z_{-ij} \in X_{-ij}$ holds:*

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} a_i p_j z_{-ij} \preccurlyeq b_i q_j z_{-ij} \\ a_i r_j z_{-ij} \succcurlyeq b_i s_j z_{-ij} \\ c_i p_j z_{-ij} \succcurlyeq d_i q_j z_{-ij} \end{array}\right\} \Rightarrow c_i r_j z_{-ij} \succcurlyeq d_i s_j z_{-ij}.$$

A1 - Weak order. $\succcurlyeq$ is a weak order.

A2 - Weak separability. For all i, if $a_i x_{-i} \succ b_i x_{-i}$ for some $a_i, b_i \in X_i$,$x_{-i} \in X_{-i}$, then $a_i y_{-i} \succcurlyeq b_i y_{-i}$ for all $y_{-i} \in X_{-i}$.

Note, that from this follows, that for any $a_i, b_i \in X_i$ either $a_i x_{-i} \succcurlyeq b_i x_{-i}$ or $b_i x_{-i} \succcurlyeq a_i x_{-i}$ for all $x_{-i} \in X_{-i}$. This allows to introduce the following definition:

Definition 4. *For all $a_i, b_i \in X_i$ define $\succcurlyeq_i$ as $a_i \succcurlyeq_i b_i \iff a_i x_{-i} \succcurlyeq b_i x_{-i}$ for all $x_{-i} \in X_{-i}$.*

Definition 5. *For any $z \in X$ define $\mathbf{SE}^z_{ij} = \{x_i x_j z_{-ij} \in X \colon x_i \succcurlyeq_i z_i, z_j \succcurlyeq_j x_j\}$, and $\mathbf{NW}^z_{ij} = \{x_i x_j z_{-ij} \in X \colon z_i \succcurlyeq_i x_i, x_j \succcurlyeq_j z_j\}$.*

A3 - Coordinate Ordering Completeness. For any $z \in X$, and all $i, j \in N$, ij-triple cancellation holds either on $\mathbf{SE}^z_{ij}$ or on $\mathbf{NW}^z_{ij}$.

This new property would allow us to divide X into subsets without the need to use the notion of comonotonicity. We can introduce the following binary relations:

Definition 6. *We write:*

1. *$i\,\mathbf{R}^z\,j$ if ij-triple cancellation holds on the set $\mathbf{SE}^z_{ij}$.*
2. *$i\,\mathbf{S}^z\,j$ if [NOT $j\,\mathbf{R}^z\,i$].*
3. *$i\,\mathbf{E}^z\,j$ if [$i\,\mathbf{R}^z\,j$ AND $j\,\mathbf{R}^z\,i$].*

Note that $\mathbf{R}^z$ is complete (which is why we have called axiom **A3** "Coordinate Ordering Completeness") and $\mathbf{S}^z$ is partial.[1] Since N is finite, there is only a finite number of various partial orders $\mathbf{S}^z$, so we can index them ($\mathbf{S}_a, \mathbf{S}_b, \ldots$) and drop the superscripts when not needed. Also, each of the partial orders $\mathbf{S}_k$ uniquely defines the corresponding $\mathbf{R}_k$ - $i\,\mathbf{R}_k\,j$ if [NOT $j\,\mathbf{S}_k\,i$].

In contrast to the case with two variables, this property alone is not sufficient to construct a representation. Comparing value functions for different attributes suggests some sort of transitivity. For example, $f_i(x_i) > f_j(x_j)$ and $f_j(x_j) > f_k(x_k)$ imply $f_i(x_i) > f_k(x_k)$. The property we introduce is weaker - it is acyclicity.

[1] if it is empty for all z, other axioms entail the existence of an additive representation on X

A3-ACYCL - Coordinate Ordering Acyclicity. For all $z \in X$, $\mathbf{S}^z$ is acyclic. In other words,

$$i\,\mathbf{S}^z\,j\,\mathbf{S}^z\ldots\mathbf{S}^z\,k \Rightarrow i\,\mathbf{R}^z\,k.$$

This axiom effectively defines how the set X is partitioned. It is required for the Choquet integral representation to exist.

We also introduce the following notions:

Definition 7. *Define* $\mathbf{SE}_{ij}$ *as a union of the following three sets:*

- *All* $z \in X$ *such that* $i\,\mathbf{R}^z\,j$*, if* z_i *is not maximal and* z_j *is not minimal;*
- *All* $z \in X$ *such that* z_i *is maximal and for no* $x_j, y_j \in X_j : z_j \succcurlyeq_j x_j \succcurlyeq_j y_j$ *we have* $j\,\mathbf{R}^{x_j z_{-j}}\,i$ *and NOT* $j\,\mathbf{R}^{y_j z_{-j}}\,i$*;*
- *All* $z \in X$ *such that* z_j *is minimal and for no* $x_i, y_i \in X_i : y_i \succcurlyeq_i x_i \succcurlyeq_i z_i$ *we have* $j\,\mathbf{R}^{x_i z_{-i}}\,i$ *and NOT* $j\,\mathbf{R}^{y_i z_{-i}}\,i$*.*

Define $\mathbf{NW}_{ij}$ *as a union of the following three sets:*

- *All* $z \in X$ *such that* $j\,\mathbf{R}^z\,i$*, if* z_j *is not maximal and* z_i *is not minimal;*
- *All* $z \in X$ *such that* z_i *is minimal and for no* $x_j, y_j \in X_j : y_j \succcurlyeq_j x_j \succcurlyeq_j z_j$ *we have* $i\,\mathbf{R}^{x_j z_{-j}}\,j$ *and NOT* $i\,\mathbf{R}^{y_j z_{-j}}\,j$*;*
- *All* $z \in X$ *such that* z_j *is maximal and for no* $x_i, y_i \in X_i : z_i \succcurlyeq_i x_i \succcurlyeq_i y_i$ *we have* $i\,\mathbf{R}^{x_i z_{-i}}\,j$ *and NOT* $i\,\mathbf{R}^{y_i z_{-i}}\,j$*.*

Presence of maximal and minimal points significantly complicates the definitions of $\mathbf{SE}_{ij}$ and $\mathbf{NW}_{ij}$, since at such points some of the sets $\mathbf{SE}^z_{ij}$ and $\mathbf{NW}^z_{ij}$ become degenerate and condition **3C-ij** trivially holds. If sets X_i and X_j do not contain minimal or maximal points, we can drop the corresponding conditions in each definition and simply state that $\mathbf{SE}_{ij} = \{z : i\,\mathbf{R}^z\,j\}$ and $\mathbf{NW}_{ij} = \{z : j\,\mathbf{R}^z\,i\}$.

Partial orders $\mathbf{S}_i$ define subsets of the set X as follows.

Definition 8. *We write* $X^{\mathbf{S}_i} = \bigcap_{(k,j):k\,\mathbf{R}_i\,j} \mathbf{SE}_{kj}$

It is well known that the sufficient property for an additive representation to exist on a Cartesian product is strong independence Krantz et al. [1971]. In the $X = Y^n$ case, the Choquet integral was previously axiomatized using comonotonic strong independence (or comonotonic trade-off consistency Wakker [1991a]). In this paper we will be using sets $X^{\mathbf{S}_i}$ to formulate a similar condition.

Definition 9. *We say that* $i \in N$ *is essential on* $A \subset X$ *if there exist* $x_i x_{-i}, y_i x_{-i} \in A$*, such that* $x_i x_{-i} \succ y_i x_{-i}$*.*

A4 - Intra-coordinate trade-off consistency

$$\left.\begin{array}{r} a_i x_{-i} \preccurlyeq b_i y_{-i} \\ a_i w_{-i} \succcurlyeq b_i z_{-i} \\ c_i x_{-i} \succcurlyeq d_i y_{-i} \end{array}\right\} \Rightarrow c_i w_{-i} \succcurlyeq d_i z_{-i},$$

provided that either:

a) Exists $X^{\mathbf{S}_j}$ such that $a_i x_{-i}, b_i y_{-i}, a_i w_{-i}, b_i z_{-i}, c_i x_{-i}, d_i y_{-i}, c_i w_{-i}, d_i z_{-i} \in X^{\mathbf{S}_j}$

b) Exist $X^{\mathbf{S}_j}, X^{\mathbf{S}_k}$ such that $a_i x_{-i}, b_i y_{-i}, a_i w_{-i}, b_i z_{-i} \in X^{\mathbf{S}_j}$, i is essential on $X^{\mathbf{S}_j}$, and $c_i x_{-i}, d_i y_{-i}, c_i w_{-i}, d_i z_{-i} \in X^{\mathbf{S}_k}$, or;

c) Exist $X^{\mathbf{S}_j}, X^{\mathbf{S}_k}$ such that $a_i x_{-i}, b_i y_{-i}, c_i x_{-i}, d_i y_{-i} \in X^{\mathbf{S}_j}$, i is essential on $X^{\mathbf{S}_j}$, and $a_i w_{-i}, b_i z_{-i}, c_i w_{-i}, d_i z_{-i} \in X^{\mathbf{S}_k}$.

Informally, the meaning of the axiom is that ordering between preference differences ("intervals") is preserved irrespective of the "measuring rods" used to measure them. However, contrary to the additive case this does not hold on all X, but only when either points involved in all four relations lie in the same "3C-set" X^{S_j}, or points involved in two relations lie in one such set and those involved in the other two in another.

A5 - Inter-coordinate trade-off consistency

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} a_i x_{-i} \preccurlyeq b_i y_{-i} \\ c_i x_{-i} \succcurlyeq d_i y_{-i} \\ a_i y^0_{-i} \sim p_j x^0_{-j} \\ b_i y^0_{-i} \sim q_j x^0_{-j} \\ c_i y^1_{-i} \sim r_j x^1_{-j} \\ d_i y^1_{-i} \sim s_j x^1_{-j} \\ p_j e_{-j} \succcurlyeq q_j f_{-j} \end{array}\right\} \Rightarrow r_j e_{-j} \succcurlyeq s_j f_{-j}$$

for all $a_i x_{-i}, b_i y_{-i}, c_i x_{-i}, d_i y_{-i} \in X^{\mathbf{S}_j}$ provided i is essential on $X^{\mathbf{S}_j}$, $a_i y^0_{-i}, b_i y^0_{-i}, c_i y^1_{-i}, d_i y^1_{-i} \in X^{\mathbf{S}_k}$, $p_j x^0_{-j}, q_j x^0_{-j}, r_j x^1_{-j}, s_j x^1_{-j} \in X^{\mathbf{S}_l}$ provided j is essential on $X^{\mathbf{S}_l}$, $p_j e_{-j}, q_j f_{-j}, r_j e_{-j}, s_j f_{-j} \in X^{\mathbf{S}_m}$.

The formal statement of the **A5** is rather complicated, but it simply means that the ordering of the "intervals" is preserved across dimensions. Together with **A4** the conditions are similar to Wakker's trade-off consistency condition Wakker [1991b] . The axiom bears even stronger similarity to Axiom 5 (compatibility) from section 8.2.6 of Krantz et al. [1971]. Roughly speaking, it says that if the "interval" between c_i and d_i is "larger" than that between a_i and b_i, then "projecting" these intervals onto another dimension by means of the equivalence relations must leave this order unchanged. We additionally require the comparison of intervals and "projection" to be consistent - meaning that each quadruple of points in each part of the statement belongs to the same $X^{\mathbf{S}_i}$. Another version of this axiom, which is used frequently in proofs, can be formulated in terms of standard sequences (Lemma 15).

A6 - Bi-independence Let $a_i x_{-i}, b_i x_{-i}, c_i x_{-i}, d_i x_{-i} \in X^{\mathbf{S}_i}$ and $a_i x_{-i} \succ b_i x_{-i}$. If for some $y_{-i} \in X_{-i}$ we have $c_i y_{-i} \succ d_i y_{-i}$, then $c_i x_{-i} \succ d_i x_{-i}$ for all $i \in N$.

This axiom is similar to "strong monotonicity" in Wakker [1991b]. We analyze its necessity and the intuition behind it in section A.2.

A7 - Essentiality All coordinates are essential on X.

A8 - Restricted solvability If $a_i x_{-i} \succcurlyeq y \succcurlyeq b_i x_{-i}$, then there exists $c : c_i x_{-i} \sim y$ for $i \in N$.

A9 - Archimedean axiom Every bounded standard sequence contained in some $X^{\mathbf{S}_i}$ is finite, and in the case of only one essential coordinate, there exists a countable order-dense subset of $X^{\mathbf{S}_i}$.

Finally, we can introduce a notion of *interacting* coordinates.

Definition 10. *Coordinates i and j are* interacting *if exists $z \in X$, such that $i\,\mathbf{S}^z\,j$ or $j\,\mathbf{S}^z\,i$. We call a set $A \subset N$ an* interaction clique *if for each $i, j \in A$ we can build a chain of coordinates $i, k, \ldots, j$, such that every two subsequent coordinates in the chain are interacting.*

Interaction cliques play an important role in the uniqueness properties of the representation. In what follows we will be considering only cliques of maximal possible size if not specified otherwise.

3.1 Additional assumptions

The following additional assumptions are made. The reasoning behind each one is explained below. They are not required for the construction of the representation in general.

"Collapsed" equivalent points along dimensions. For no $i \in N$ and no $a_i, b_i \in X_i$ holds $a_i x_{-i} \sim b_i x_{-i}$ for all $x_{-i} \in X_{-i}$.

If this wasn't true, we could have value functions assigning the same value to several points in the same set X_i. To simplify things we exclude such case, however, it can be easily reconstructed once the representation is built.

Density. We assume that for all $i \in N$, whenever $a_i x_{-i} \succ b_i x_{-i}$, there exists $c_i \in X_i$ such that $a_i x_{-i} \succ c_i x_{-i} \succ b_i x_{-i}$ (X is order dense).

"Closedness". For every i and j, if there exist $x_i x_j z_{-ij}$ such that $i\,\mathbf{S}^{x_i x_j z_{-ij}}\,j$ and $y_i x_j z_{-ij}$ such that $j\,\mathbf{S}^{y_i x_j z_{-ij}}\,i$, then exists $z_i \in X_i$ such that $i\,\mathbf{E}^{z_i x_j z_{-ij}}\,j$.

This assumption says that sets $\mathbf{SE}_{ij}$ and $\mathbf{NW}_{ij}$ are "closed". In the representation this translates into existence of the inverse for all points where value functions f_i and f_j are equal, provided i and j are interacting. This is a technical simplifying assumption and the proof can be done without it.

Geometry of X. For every clique of interacting variables $A \subset N$, there exist at least two points $r_A^0, r_A^1 \in X$ such, that for every pair $i, j \in A$, we have $i\,\mathbf{E}^{r_A^0}\,j$ and $i\,\mathbf{E}^{r_A^1}\,j$.

Again, this is a simplifying assumption, making the proof somewhat less general and closer to the homogeneous case. Without it we can have a situation, where the smallest value of $f_i : X_i$ is larger then the greatest value of $f_j : X_j$ for some $i, j \in N$. This in turn does not allow to construct the capacity in a unique way. Another way to stating this assumption, is to say that X must contain points corresponding to all possible acyclic partial orders on N, generated by interacting pairs $i\,\mathbf{S}\,j$. Work to remove this assumption is still in progress.

4 Representation theorem

As follows from the definition of the Choquet integral (Section 2), every point $x \in X$ uniquely corresponds to a set of weights $p_i^x : p_i^x \geq 0, \sum_{i \in N} p_i^x = 1$. This notation is used to simplify the statement of the following theorems.

Theorem 1. *Let $\succcurlyeq$ be an order on X and the structural assumption hold. Then, if axioms **A1-A9** are satisfied, there exists a capacity ν and value functions $f_1 : X_1 \to \mathbb{R}, \ldots, f_n : X_n \to \mathbb{R}$, such that $\succcurlyeq$ can be represented by the Choquet integral:*

$$x \succcurlyeq y \iff C(\nu, (f_1(x_1), \ldots, f_n(x_n))) \geq C(\nu, (f_1(y_1), \ldots, f_n(y_n))), \tag{1}$$

for all $x, y \in X$.

Capacity and value functions have the following uniqueness properties. Let $\mathcal{I} = \{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$ be a partition of N, such that $m(B) = 0$ for all $B \subset N$ such that $B \cap A_i \neq \emptyset, B \cap A_j \neq \emptyset$. If no such partition exists, let $\mathcal{I} = \{N\}$.

Theorem 2. *Let $g_1 : X_1 \to \mathbb{R}, \ldots, g_n : X_n \to \mathbb{R}$ be such that (1) holds with f_i substituted by g_i. Then, at all $x_i \in X_i$, such that for some z_{-i} we have $p_i^{x_i z_{-i}} > 0$, and also $p_j^{x_i z_{-i}} > 0, j \neq i$, value functions f_i and g_i are related in the following way:*

$$f_i(x_i) = \alpha_{A_j} g_i(x_i) + \beta_{A_j},$$

Capacity changes as follows

$$m'(B) = \frac{\alpha_{A_j} m(B)}{\sum_{C \subset A_i, A_i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{A_i} m(C)}.$$

At the remaining points of X, i.e. for x_i such that for any $z_{-i} \in X_{-i}$ we have $p_i^{x_i z_{-i}} = 1$, and $p_j^{x_i z_{-i}} = 0$ for all $j \neq i$, value functions f_i have the following uniqueness properties[2]*:*

$$f_i(x_i) = \psi_i(g_i(x_i)),$$

where ψ_i is an increasing function, and for all $j \in N, j \neq i$, such that exists $A \in N : i, j \in A, m(A) > 0$, we additionally have

$$f_i(x_i) = f_j(x_j) \iff g_i(x_i) = g_j(x_j).$$

.

5 Additive representations on X^{S_a}

We start by removing maximal and minimal elements from the sets X_i. The representation will be extended to these points in Section 8.

Similar to [Wakker, 1991b] we will be covering the sets X^{S_a} with "rectangular" subsets. Given a point $z \in X^{S_a}$ we construct a "rectangular" set $X^{z(S_a)}$ in the following way:

[2]Due to our assumption that for no a_i, b_i we have $a_i z_{-i} \sim b_i z_{-i}$ for all z_{-i}, we can't have $p^{x_i z_{-i}} = 0$ for all z_{-i}.

- If j is minimal in $\mathbf{S}_a$, then $X_j^{z(S_a)} = x_j \in X_j : z_j \succcurlyeq_j x_j$.
- If j is maximal in $\mathbf{S}_a$, then $X_j^{z(S_a)} = x_j \in X_j : x_j \succcurlyeq_j z_j$.
- If j is neither maximal not minimal, then $X_j^{z(S_a)} = [x_j \in X_j : x_j \succcurlyeq_j z_j, x_j z_{-j} \in X^{S_a}]$.
- If for no k we have $j \, \mathbf{S}_a \, k$ or $k \, \mathbf{S}_a \, j$, then $X_j^{z(S_a)} = X_j$.

5.1 Constructing additive representation on $X^{z(S_a)}$

We assume that X^{S_a} has at least two essential coordinates. By Lemma 18, all sets $X^{z(S_a)}$ therefore have at least two essential coordinates. Moreover, the essential coordinates are the same across all sets.

Theorem 3. *For any $z \in X^{S_a}$ there exists an additive representation of $\succcurlyeq$ on $X^{z(S_a)}$:*

$$x \succcurlyeq y \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{n} V_i^z(x_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} V_i^z(y_i),$$

for all $x, y \in X^{z(S_a)}$.

Proof. $X^{z(S_a)}$ is a Cartesian product, $\succcurlyeq$ is a weak order on $X^{z(S_a)}$, $\succcurlyeq$ satisfies generalized triple cancellation on $X^{z(S_a)}$, $\succcurlyeq$ satisfies Archimedean axiom on $X^{z(S_a)}$, at least two coordinates are essential. It remains to show that $\succcurlyeq$ satisfies restricted solvability on $X^{z(S_a)}$.

Assume that for some $x_i z_{-i}, w, y_i z_{-i} \in X^{z(S_a)}$, we have $x_i z_{-i} \succcurlyeq w \succcurlyeq y_i z_{-i}$, hence exists $z_i \in X_i : z_i z_{-i} \sim w$. We need to show that $z_i z_{-i} \in X^{S_a}$. If $w \sim x_i z_{-i}$ or $w \sim y_i z_{-i}$, then the conclusion is immediate (since either point belongs to $X^{z(S_a)}$). Hence, assume $x_i z_{-i} \succ z_i z_{-i} \succ y_i z_{-i}$. This means that $x_i \succcurlyeq_i z_i \succcurlyeq_i y_i$. Since z_i is "sandwiched" between x_i and y_i we conclude that for any $j \in N \setminus i$, $i \, \mathbf{S}^{x_i z_{-i}} \, j$ and $i \, \mathbf{S}^{y_i z_{-i}} \, j$ imply also $i \, \mathbf{S}^{z_i z_{-i}} \, j$, and symmetrically $j \, \mathbf{S}^{x_i z_{-i}} \, i$ and $j \, \mathbf{S}^{y_i z_{-i}} \, i$ imply $j \, \mathbf{S}^{z_i z_{-i}} \, i$. Hence, it is also in X^{S_a}.

Therefore all conditions for the existence of an additive representation are met [Wakker, 1991a]. □

5.2 Joint representation V^{S_a} on X^{S_a}

This section is based on [Wakker, 1991b] with some modifications.

Theorem 4. *There exists an additive interval scale $V^{S_a}(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} V_i^{S_a}(z_i)$ on X^{S_a}, which represents $\succcurlyeq$ on every $X^{z(S_a)}$ with $z \in X^{S_a}$.*

Proof. Choose the reference set - pick any $r \in X^{S_a}$ such that $X_i^{r(S_a)}$ contains more than two points for any X^{S_a}-essential i. Choose a "zero" point - any $r^0 \in X^{r(S_a)}$, and a "unit mark" - a point $r_k^1 r_{-k}^0 \in X^{r(S_a)}$, such that:

- k is essential on X^{S_a},
- $r_k^1 \succcurlyeq_k r_k^0$.

Set $V_i^r(r_i^0) = 0$ for all $i \in N$ and $V_k^r(r_k^1) = 1$. This uniquely defines unit and locations of all $V_i^r, i \in N$.

In the following we assume that sets $X_i^{z(S_a)}, X_k^{z(S_a)}$ each contain at least two points, otherwise, alignment is trivial.

Assume $X_i^{r(S_a)} \cap X_i^{z(S_a)} = \emptyset$ and $X_k^{r(S_a)} \cap X_k^{z(S_a)} = \emptyset$ (variations are all covered by the below procedure). We will construct two auxiliary points z' and r' such that $X_i^{z'(S_a)} \subset X_i^{z(S_a)}$, $X_i^{z'(S_a)} \subset X_i^{r(S_a)}$, $X_k^{r'(S_a)} \subset X_k^{z(S_a)}$, $X_k^{r'(S_a)} \subset X_k^{r(S_a)}$. It would allow us to align first V^r and $V^{r'}$, then $V^{r'}$ and $V^{z'}$, and finally $V^{z'}$ and V^z.

Construct the point z' by taking coordinate-wise maxima of r and z for coordinates j such that $j \mathbf{R}_a i$, not including i itself, and coordinate-wise minima of r and z for coordinates j, such that $i \mathbf{R}_a j$ and i itself. In the short notation the first point is $z' := \max(r_j, z_j)_{j:j \mathbf{R}_a i} \min(r_j, z_j)_{j=i, j:i \mathbf{R}_a j}$. The second point r' is constructed by taking coordinate-wise maxima of r and z for coordinates j such that $j \mathbf{R}_a k$, not including k itself, and coordinate-wise minima of r and z for coordinates j, such that $k \mathbf{R}_a j$ and k itself. In the short notation the second point looks like $r' := \max(r_j, z_j)_{j:j \mathbf{R}_a k} \min(r_j, z_j)_{j=k, j:k \mathbf{R}_a j}$.

Note that both points are in X^{S_a} since relations $j \mathbf{R}_a l$ remain intact for all pairs j, l. Note also, that $X_i^{z'(S_a)}$ contains both $X_i^{z(S_a)}$ and $X_i^{r(S_a)}$, and $X_k^{r'(S_a)}$ contains both $X_k^{z(S_a)}$ and $X_k^{r(S_a)}$.

Now we have that sets $(X_i^{z(S_a)} \times X_k^{z(S_a)}) \cap (X_i^{z'(S_a)} \times X_k^{z'(S_a)})$, $(X_i^{z'(S_a)} \times X_k^{z'(S_a)}) \cap (X_i^{r'(S_a)} \times X_k^{r'(S_a)})$, $(X_i^{r'(S_a)} \times X_k^{r'(S_a)}) \cap (X_i^{r(S_a)} \times X_k^{r(S_a)})$ are all non-empty, and each dimension contains more than two points. Relation $\succcurlyeq_{i,k}$ on these sets satisfies Archimedean axiom, restricted solvability, and **A4**. Hence we can apply standard uniqueness properties of additive representations. We first align $V_k^{r'}$ with V_k^r and $V_i^{r'}$ with V_i^r, then $V_k^{z'}$ with $V_k^{r'}$ and $V_i^{z'}$ with $V_i^{r'}$, and finally V_k^z with $V_k^{z'}$ and V_i^z with $V_i^{z'}$ by changing the common unit and locations of corresponding value functions.

Having aligned like this V_i^z and V_k^z with V_i^r and V_k^r for all $z \in X^{S_a}$ we can perform the same alignment operation for all remaining essential coordinates j, using pairs V_j^z and V_k^z. At this stage, functions V_k^z are already aligned, hence have a correct unit and location. As above, uniqueness properties of additive representations of relation $\succcurlyeq_{j.k}$ imply that the unit of functions V_j^z is already aligned with that of V_j^r and only location change has to be performed. This can also be done as above.

Once such alignment has been performed for all essential coordinates, we can verify that this is done consistently throughout X^{S_a}. In particular, for any s and t from X^{S_a} we must be able to show that for any essential $j \in N$, we have $V_j^s = V_j^t$ on $X_j^{s(S_a)} \cap X_j^{t(S_a)}$. To show this a following argument can be used. During the initial alignment of V_j^s and V_j^t, auxiliary points t' and s' were used, such that $X_j^{s'(S_a)}$ includes $X_j^{s(S_a)}$ and $X_j^{r(S_a)}$, and $X_j^{t'(S_a)}$ includes $X_j^{t(S_a)}$ and $X_j^{r(S_a)}$. Hence, functions $V_j^{s'}$ and $V_j^{t'}$ coincide with V_j^r on $X_j^{r(S_a)}$. To show that they coincide on all common domain, including $X_j^{s(S_a)} \cap X_j^{t(S_a)}$, we just need to follow the same procedure as before and construct a point that contains $X_k^{s'(X_a)}$ and $X_k^{t'(X_a)}$ for some essential k. Then a uniqueness argument can be evoked once again, and since $V_j^{s'}$ and $V_j^{t'}$ coincide on $X_j^{r(S_a)}$, they would necessarily coincide also on the remaining common domain, which includes $X_j^{s(S_a)} \cap X_j^{t(S_a)}$. Finally, since $V_j^s = V_j^{s'}$ on $X_j^{s(S_a)}$, and $V_j^t = V_j^{t'}$ on on $X_j^{t(S_a)}$, we get that $V_j^s = V_j^t$ on $X_j^{s(S_a)} \cap X_j^{t(S_a)}$.

At this point we can drop the superscripts and define functions $V_i^{S_a}$ which coincide with $V_i^{z(S_a)}$ for all $z \in X^{S_a}$ on the corresponding domains. By the above argument, these functions are well-defined.

□

5.3 V^{S_a} is globally representing on X^{S_a}

Lemma 1. *For all X^{S_a}-essential $i \in N$, $V_i^{S_a}$ represents $\succcurlyeq_i$ on $X_i^{S_a}$.*

Proof. Let $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in X_i^{S_a}$ be such that $\alpha_i \succcurlyeq_i \beta_i$. Similarly to the construction of r' and z' in the proof of theorem 4, we can show that always exists x_i such that $\alpha_i x_{-i}, \beta_i x_{-i} \in X^{S_a}$. The conclusion follows. □

Theorem 5. *Representation V^{S_a} obtained in Theorem 4 is globally representing on X^{S_a}.*

Proof. We need to show that $x \succcurlyeq y \iff V^{S_a}(x) \geq V^{S_a}(y)$.

- If exists z such that $x, y \in X^{z(S_a)}$ then the result is immediate.
- If the above is not true, we will show that exists $x' \sim x$ such that $V^{S_a}(x) = V^{S_a}(x')$ and $x'_i \succcurlyeq_i y_i$ for all i.

The procedure is identical to Wakker [1991a] with some minor modifications.

1. Find i such that $y_i \succ_i x_i$ and $x_k \succcurlyeq_k y_k$ for all k such that $k \, \mathbf{S}_a \, i$. We have $y_i x_{-i} \in X^{S_a}$ (since for all $k \in N$ such that $k \, \mathbf{S}_a \, i$ we have $x_k \succcurlyeq y_k$, hence $k \, \mathbf{R}^{y_i y_{-i}} \, i$ implies $k \, \mathbf{R}^{y_i x_{-i}} \, i$, whereas for all $t \in N$ such that $i \, \mathbf{S}_a \, t$ we have $i \, \mathbf{R}^{x_i x_{-i}} \, t$, hence $i \, \mathbf{R}^{y_i x_{-i}}$).
2. Similarly, find j such that $x_j \succ_j y_j$ and $y_k \succcurlyeq_k x_k$ for all k such that $j \, \mathbf{S}_a \, k$. By similar reasoning, $y_j x_{-j} \in X^{S_a}$.
3. We are increasing x_i and decreasing x_j and thus move in the direction of y.
4. Note, that $x_{-ij} y_i y_j \in X^{S_a}$.
5. If $x_{-ij} y_i y_j \succcurlyeq x$, then by restricted solvability ($x_{-ij} y_i y_j \succcurlyeq x \succcurlyeq x_{-ij} x_i y_j$) exists $x' := x_{-ij} x'_i y_j \sim x$, where $y_i \succcurlyeq_i x'_i \succcurlyeq_i x_i$. If $x \succ x_{-ij} y_i y_j$, then by restricted solvability ($x_{-ij} y_i x_j \succcurlyeq x \succ x_{-ij} y_i y_j$) exists $x' := x_{-ij} y_i x'_j \sim x$, and $x_j \succcurlyeq_j x'_j \succcurlyeq_J y_j$.
6. In both cases, the resulting point x' is in X^{S_a}, moreover $x', x \in X^{z(S_a)}$ where $z := x_{ij} x_i y_j$, hence x' has the same V^{S_a}-value as x, but one more coordinate becomes identical to that of y.
7. After repeating the procedure unless $x'_i \succcurlyeq_i y_i$ (at most n times), we get the result by Lemma 1.
8. Moreover, if $x \sim y$, we at the end of the procedure we would necessarily arrive to y itself (by strong monotonicity as in Lemma 18, and structural assumption **SA1**). Hence we get $x \succ y \Rightarrow V^{S_a}(x) > V^{S_a}(y)$ and $x \sim y \Rightarrow V^{S_a}(x) = V^{S_a}(y)$, which implies that $x \succcurlyeq y \iff V^{S_a}(x) \geq V^{S_a}(y)$

□

6 Aligning cardinal representations for different X^{S_a}

There can be several cases depending on what variables are essential on various sets X^{S_i}. We start with the case where exist X^{S_a} and X^{S_b} having at least two essential variables each.

6.1 Exist at least two sets X^{S_i} with at least two essential coordinates

Theorem 6. *Assume that at least two coordinates are essential on X^{S_a} and X^{S_b}. For any $i \in N$ that is essential on both areas, it holds $V_i^{S_a}(z_i) = \lambda_i^{ab} V_i^{S_b}(z_i)$ for all z_i from the common domain of $V_i^{S_a}(z_i)$ and $V_i^{S_b}(z_i)$, if a common location is chosen for both functions.*

Proof. If the common domain of $V_i^{S_a}(z_i)$ and $V_i^{S_b}(z_i)$ is empty or contains just one point, the result is trivial. [3] Assume that i, j are essential on X^{S_a} and i, l are essential on X^{S_b}. First, we will establish that a standard sequence on coordinate i in X^{S_a} is also a standard sequence in X^{S_b} (provided all points of the sequence lie within a common domain of $V_i^{S_a}(z_i)$ and $V_i^{S_b}(z_i)$). This follows from **A4**. Build any standard sequence $X_i^{S_a}$, say $\{\alpha_i^k : \alpha_i^k v_j x_{-ij} \sim \alpha_i^{k+1} w_j x_{-ij}\}$. Then, $\{\alpha_i^k : \alpha_i^k t_l x_{-il} \sim \alpha_i^{k+1} u_l x_{-il}\}$ is a standard sequence in S_b, i.e. if exist $t_l, u_l \in X_l$ such that $\alpha_i^k t_l x_{-il} \sim \alpha_i^{k+1} u_l x_{-il}$ for some k, then by **A4**:

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \alpha_i^k v_j x_{-ij} &\sim \alpha_i^{k+1} w_j x_{-ij} \\ \alpha_i^k t_l x_{-il} &\sim \alpha_i^{k+1} u_l x_{-il} \\ \alpha_i^{k+1} v_j x_{-ij} &\sim \alpha_i^{k+2} w_j x_{-ij} \end{aligned}\right\} \Rightarrow \alpha_i^{k+1} t_l x_{-il} \sim \alpha_i^{k+2} u_l x_{-il}$$

Pick two points r_i^0 and r_i^1 in the common domain and set $V_i^{S_a}(r_i^0) = V_i^{S_b}(r_i^0) = 0$. Assume we now have $V_i^{S_a}(r_i^1) = v_a$ and $V_i^{S_b}(r_i^1) = v_b$. We need to show that for any point z_i from the common domain of $V_i^{S_a}$ and $V_i^{S_b}$ we have $V_i^{S_a}(z_i) = \lambda_i^{ab} V_i^{S_a}(z_i)$, where $\lambda_i^{ab} = \frac{v_b}{v_a}$.

Build standard sequences from r_i^0 to r_i^1, and from r_i^0 to z_i. We have

$$V_i^{S_a}(r_i^1) - V_i^{S_a}(r_i^0) \approx n[V_j^{S_a}(v_j) - V_j^{S_a}(w_j)]$$
$$V_i^{S_a}(z_i) - V_i^{S_a}(r_i^0) \approx m[V_j^{S_a}(v_j) - V_j^{S_a}(w_j)].$$

$V_i^{S_a}(r_i^0) = 0$, hence

$$V_i^{S_a}(z_i) \approx \frac{m V_i^{S_a}(r_i^1)}{n}.$$

Such n and m exist by the Archimedean axiom. By the argument above we get

$$V_i^{S_b}(r_i^1) - V_i^{S_b}(r_i^0) \approx n[V_j^{S_b}(t_l) - V_j^{S_b}(u_l)]$$
$$V_i^{S_b}(z_i) - V_i^{S_b}(r_i^0) \approx m[V_j^{S_b}(t_l) - V_j^{S_b}(u_l)].$$

[3] Obviously, the common domain is not empty if we assume **SA4**, in which case r_i^0 and r_i^1 are in the common domain by assumption

Similarly,

$$V_i^{S_b}(z_i) \approx \frac{mV_i^{S_b}(r_i^1)}{n}.$$

By density, we can pick an arbitrary small step of the standard sequences, so the ratio $\frac{m}{n}$ converges to a limit. Thus, finally

$$V_i^{S_a}(z_i) = \frac{V_i^{S_a}(r_i^1)}{V_i^{S_b}(r_i^1)} V_i^{S_b}(z_i) = \frac{v_a}{v_b} V_i^{S_b}(z_i) = \alpha_i^{ab} V_i^{S_b}(z_i).$$

□

We proceed by picking common locations for all value functions. Since r^0 belongs to all X^{S_a}, we can set $V_i^a(r_i^0) = 0$. At this point we can drop superscripts and say that we have representations $\lambda_i^a V_i + \ldots + \lambda_n^a V_n$ on each X^{S_a}, defining also $\lambda_i^a := 0$ for variables i that are inessential on the set X^{S_a}.

6.2 Final rescaling

By assumption, we have two points two points r^0 and r^1 such that $i\,\mathbf{E}^{r^0}\,j$ and $i\,\mathbf{E}^{r^1}\,j$ for every interacting i, j. From this follows, that both points belong to every X^{S_i}. We can assume that $r_i^1 \succcurlyeq_i r_i^0$ for all $i \in N$ (for variables not interacting with others we can take it to be so, for others see results in Section A.5). Set $V_i(r_i^0) = 0$ for all $i \in N$. Choose some $j \in N$, such that j is essential on at least one X^{S_a}, which has two or more essential variables (including j). Set $V_j(r_j^1) = 1$. This sets unit and location for all functions V_i such, that i is essential on some X^{S_a} where at least one more coordinate is essential. For each such V_i, we now have $V_i(r_i^1) = k_i$ (thus $k_j = 1$). Define $\phi_i := \frac{V_i}{k_i}$, for all $i \in N$. Additive representations on various X^{S_a} now have the form $\lambda_1^a k_1 \phi_1(x_1) + \ldots + \lambda_n^a k_n \phi_n(x_n)$. Finally, re-scale one more time by dividing everything by the sum of coefficients:

$$\frac{\lambda_1^a k_1}{\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^a k_i} \phi_1(x_1) + \ldots + \frac{\lambda_n^a k_n}{\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^a k_i} \phi_n(x_n)$$

Denoting $\alpha_j^a = \frac{\lambda_j^a k_j}{\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^a k_i}$, we arrive to:

$$\phi^a(x) := \alpha_1^a \phi_1(x_1) + \ldots + \alpha_n^a \phi_n(x_n),$$

note that $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1$.

Note that here we set $\phi_i(r_i^0) = 0$ and $\phi_i(r_i^1) = 1$ for all i. As will be shown in the Section 9, this can be relaxed - origin and scaling factors can be chosen individually for each clique.

7 Constructing global representation on X

At this stage we can show that representations $\phi^a(x) = \alpha_1^a \phi_1(x_1) + \ldots + \alpha_n^a \phi_n(x_n)$ assign the same value to equivalence classes of $\succcurlyeq$ in all X^{S_i}. To simplify the construction in the main theorem of this section, we introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *For every X^{S_a} and every $z \in X^{S_a}$, such that $r^0 \succ z$, we can find z', such that $z' \sim z$, $z' \in X^{S_a}$, and $r_i^0 \succcurlyeq_i z_i$. Likewise, for every $y \in X^{S_a}$, such that $y \succ r^0$, we can find y', such that $y' \sim y$, $y' \in X^{S_a}$, and $y_i \succcurlyeq_i r_i^0$.*

Proof. We can use the same procedure as was used in the proof of Theorem 5. For the case $y \succ r^0$ the procedure is exactly the same, while for $r^0 \succ z$ it is symmetric, as we are moving z this time, and not r^0. □

Notice that as a result of the rescaling made in Section 6.2, points r^0 and r^1 have the same values (0 and 1) in all X^{S_a} (since values of all ϕ_i are equal, weights α_i^a sum up to 1, and weights of all inessential variables are zero).

Theorem 7. *Let each of X^{S_a} and X^{S_b} have at least two essential variables. Then for any $x \in X^{S_a}, y \in X^{S_b}$ we have $x \succcurlyeq y$ iff $\phi^a(x) \geqslant \phi^b(y)$.*

Proof. First take $x \sim y$, such that $x \in X^{S_a}$, and $y \in X^{S_b}$. If $x \sim y \sim r^0$ or $x \sim y \sim r^1$, the conclusion is immediate, so assume otherwise. Let $x \succ r^0$. Using Lemma 2 we construct $x' \in X^{S_a}$ and $y' \in X^{S_b}$, such that $x \sim y \sim x' \sim y'$ and $x_i' \succcurlyeq_i r_i^0$, while $y_i' \succcurlyeq_i r_i^0$.

Next, build equispaced sequences from r^0 to r^1 in X^{S_a} and X^{S_b}, such that first steps of each sequence are equivalent (see details in Section A.3). By **A5** the number of steps in both sequences is equal.

Finally, build sequences from r^0 to x' and y' (coordinate-wise dominance simplifies construction of the sequences). The number of steps again must be equal, hence the ratios between the number of steps it takes to reach r^1 and x', and between the number of steps it takes to reach r^1 and y' are equal, and hence taking the limit, we get $\phi^a(x) = \phi^a(x') = \phi^b(y') = \phi^b(y)$.

The same approach applies for $x \succ y$. By **A5** the number of steps in the equispaced sequence from r^0 to x must be greater, than in the sequence from r^0 to y. Hence also $\phi^a(x) > \phi^b(x)$.

We now have $x \sim y \Rightarrow \phi^a(x) = \phi^b(y)$ and $x \succ y \Rightarrow \phi^a(x) > \phi^b(y)$. This implies that $x \succcurlyeq y \iff \phi^a(x) \geq \phi^b(y)$. □

At this point we can define value functions on the areas with a single essential variable. Theorem 7 establishes that all areas with two or more essential coordinates assign the same value to points from the same equivalence class. Define the value assigned to an equivalence class belonging to an area with a single essential coordinate to be the same, as it has in some area with two or more essential coordinates. Such equivalence classes must exist (e.g. those containing points r^0 and r^1). Finally, define $\alpha_i^a = 1$ for the essential coordinate i and $\alpha_j^a = 0$ for all other j. If after this procedure there remain points in some X_i, for which ϕ_i is not yet defined, then we have some equivalence classes to which none of the representations ϕ^k assign any value. Since all equivalence classes found in the sets X^{S_k}, which have two or more essential variables, by now have a defined value, such classes are entirely within sets, that have only a single essential variable. Hence, we can trivially extend the representations, and get also $\phi_i(x_i) > \phi_i(y_i)$ iff $x_i \succcurlyeq_i y_i$ (see Lemma 7 which shows that functions are well-defined).

Lemma 3. *Given* $\mathbf{S}_a$ *and* $\mathbf{S}_b$*, such that exists* $A \subset N$*, for which we have* $i\,\mathbf{R}_a\,j$ *iff* $i\,\mathbf{R}_b\,j$ *for all* $i \in A, j \in N \setminus A$*, the following is true*

$$\sum_{i \in A} \alpha_i^a = \sum_{i \in A} \alpha_i^b.$$

Proof. Consider $r_A^1 r_{-A}^0$, which belongs both to X^{S_a} and X^{S_b}. By Theorem 7 and the above construction of value functions for the areas with a single essential coordinate, we have $\phi^a(r_A^1 r_{-A}^0) = \phi^b(r_A^1 r_{-A}^0)$, hence $\sum_{i \in A} \alpha_i^a \phi(r_i^1) = \sum_{i \in A} \alpha_i^b \phi(r_i^1)$, from which the conclusion follows as $\phi_i(r_i^1) = 1$ for all $i \in N$. □

Now we can proceed with construction of a unique *capacity* $\nu : 2^N \to \mathbb{R}$ from coefficients α_i^a which exist on various X^{S_a}. As shown in Wakker [1989], the condition of Lemma 3 is a necessary requirement for this. Capacity ν also has a unique Möbius transform $m : 2^N \to \mathbb{R}$ (see definition in Section 2.1).

We can now construct a representation very similar to the Choquet integral. In order to so, let us define the following function first: $\Phi_\wedge(x, A) := \phi_i(x_i)$ for i such that $j\,\mathbf{R}^x\,i$ for all $j \in A \setminus i$, in case when this is true for several i, any can be chosen. We can now construct a global value function (cf. Section 2.1):

$$\phi(x) := \sum_{A \in N} m(A) \Phi_\wedge(x, A). \tag{2}$$

It is easy to see that for each $x \in X$ and every X^{S_i}, such that $x \in X^{S_i}$, we have $\phi^a(x) = \phi(x)$. Now we can show that $\phi_i(x_i) = \phi_j(x_j)$ whenever $i\,\mathbf{E}^x\,j$, providing i, j interact.

Lemma 4. *For any non-extreme* $x \in X$ *it holds:*

$$i\,\mathbf{E}^x\,j \Rightarrow \phi_i(x_i) = \phi_j(x_j),$$

unless i *and* j *do not interact.*

Proof. Assume $x \in X^{S_a}, x \in X^{S_b}$ such that kS_al whenever kS_bl for all $k, l \in N$ apart from i, j, for which we have iS_aj and jS_bi. By Theorem 7, $\phi^a(x) = \phi^b(x)$ and by Lemma 3, it is trivial to show that $\alpha_k^a = \alpha_k^b$ for all $k \neq i, j$, and $\alpha_i^a + \alpha_j^a = \alpha_i^b + \alpha_j^b$.

We have $\alpha_i^a \phi_i(x_i) + \alpha_j^a \phi_j(x_j) = \alpha_i^b \phi_i(x_i) + \alpha_j^b \phi_j(x_j)$ (other sum components cancel out). Dividing by $\alpha_i^a + \alpha_j^a = \alpha_i^b + \alpha_j^b$, we get a convex combination of $\phi_i(x_i)$ and $\phi_j(x_j)$ on both sides. From this follows that either $\phi_i(x_i) = \phi_j(x_j)$ or $\alpha_i^a = \alpha_i^b$ and $\alpha_j^a = \alpha_j^b$.

Assume the latter. Repeating this operation for all possible combinations of X^{S_k} and X^{S_l} would lead us to the conclusion that $m(B) = 0$ for all $B \supset \{i, j\}$, as weights $\alpha_i^k, \alpha_i^l, \alpha_j^k, \alpha_j^l$ do not change when we move from X^{S_k} to X^{S_l}, and, accordingly, from ϕ^k to ϕ^l. The conclusion results from equation (2).

Finally, we can show that this implies that i and j do not interact. This means that ij-triple cancellation -

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} a_i p_j z_{-ij} \preccurlyeq b_i q_j z_{-ij} \\ a_i r_j z_{-ij} \succcurlyeq b_i s_j z_{-ij} \\ c_i p_j z_{-ij} \succcurlyeq d_i q_j z_{-ij} \end{array}\right\} \Rightarrow c_i r_j z_{-ij} \succcurlyeq d_i s_j z_{-ij},$$

holds for all $a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i \in X_i$, $p_j, q_j, r_j, s_j \in X_j$, and all $z_{-ij} \in X_{-ij}$. To show this, use equation (2) to write the values for all involved points, grouping the sum components as follows. For example, for $a_i p_j z_{-ij}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(a_i p_j z_{-ij}) = &\sum_{\substack{A \supset i \\ A \not\supset j}} m(A)\Phi_\wedge(a_i p_j z_{-ij}, A) + \sum_{\substack{A \supset j \\ A \not\supset i}} m(A)\Phi_\wedge(a_i p_j z_{-ij}, A) + \\ &+ \sum_{A \not\supset i,j} m(A)\Phi_\wedge(a_i p_j z_{-ij}, A) + \sum_{A \supset i,j} m(A)\Phi_\wedge(a_i p_j z_{-ij}, A).\end{aligned}$$

Notice, that due to the above argument, we have $\sum_{A \supset i,j} m(A)\Phi_\wedge(a_i p_j z_{-ij}, A) = 0$. Also notice that $\sum_{\substack{A \supset j \\ A \not\supset i}} m(A)\Phi_\wedge(a_i p_j z_{-ij}, A)$ does not depend on a_i, and $\sum_{A \not\supset i,j} m(A)\Phi_\wedge(a_i p_j z_{-ij}, A)$ does not depend on a_i or p_j.

Assume, towards a contradiction, that $d_i s_j z_{-ij} \succ c_i r_j z_{-ij}$. Writing values for all points, and summing the first and the third, and the second and the fourth inequalities gives:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{A \supset i \\ A \not\supset j}} m(A)[\Phi_\wedge(a_i p_j z_{-ij}, A) + \Phi_\wedge(d_i p_j z_{-ij}, A)] &\leq \sum_{\substack{A \supset i \\ A \not\supset j}} m(A)[\Phi_\wedge(b_i p_j z_{-ij}, A) + \Phi_\wedge(c_i p_j z_{-ij}, A)] \\ \sum_{\substack{A \supset i \\ A \not\supset j}} m(A)[\Phi_\wedge(a_i p_j z_{-ij}, A) + \Phi_\wedge(d_i p_j z_{-ij}, A)] &> \sum_{\substack{A \supset i \\ A \not\supset j}} m(A)[\Phi_\wedge(b_i p_j z_{-ij}, A) + \Phi_\wedge(c_i p_j z_{-ij}, A)],\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, ij-triple cancellation holds for all $a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i \in X_i$, $p_j, q_j, r_j, s_j \in X_j$, and all $z_{-ij} \in X_{-ij}$, and thus i and j do not interact. □

Lemma 5. *If for some $z \in X$ we have $i \,\mathbf{S}^z\, j$, then $\phi_i(z_i) > \phi_j(z_j)$.*

Proof. It is easy to verify that (due to the "Closedness" assumption), there exists $x_{ij} z_{-ij}$, such that $i \,\mathbf{E}^{x_{ij} z_{-ij}}\, j$ and $z_i \succcurlyeq_i x_i$, whereas $x_j \succcurlyeq_j z_j$. Since ϕ_i represents $\succcurlyeq_i$, by Lemma 4, and the fact that $\succcurlyeq_i$ is asymmetric (due to the structural assumption), we have $\phi_i(z_i) > \phi_i(x_i) = \phi_j(x_j) > \phi_j(z_j)$. □

Now we have that $[i \,\mathbf{E}^x\, j] \Rightarrow [\phi_i(x_i) = \phi_j(x_j)]$ for interacting i, j, and $[i \,\mathbf{S}^x\, j] \Rightarrow [\phi_i(x_i) > \phi_j(x_j)]$, hence we conclude that $[i \,\mathbf{R}^x\, j] \iff [\phi_i(x_i) \succcurlyeq \phi_j(x_j)]$ for all interacting i, j, which allows us to finally rewrite (2) as the Choquet integral:

$$\phi(x) = \sum_{A \subset N} m(A) \min_{i \in A} f_i(x_i).$$

To summarize the results of this section we state the following lemma:

Lemma 6. *Let $X_i' := X \setminus \{$ maximal and minimal elements of $X\}$. Let $X' := X_1' \times \ldots \times X_n'$. Assume that at least one of the sets X'^{S_a}, defined as previously, has more than two essential variables. Then for every $x, y \in X'$ we have*

$$x \succcurlyeq y \iff \phi(x) \geq \phi(y).$$

7.1 Case with a single essential variable on every X^{S_a}

For this case we only need **A3** to construct the representation. Since $\succcurlyeq$ is a weak order and each X^{S_i} has a countable order-dense subset, there exists a function $F : X \Rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that $x \succcurlyeq y \iff F(x) \geq F(y)$. To perform the construction of the value functions we need the following lemma.

Lemma 7. *Let $x_i z_{-i} \in X^{S_a}$ and $y_i z_{-i} \in X^{S_b}$. Let also i be the only essential coordinate on X^{S_a} and X^{S_b}. Then, $x_i z_{-i} \sim y_i z_{-i}$.*

Proof. The idea of the proof is to "trace a path" from X^{S_a} to X^{S_b} by constructing a sequence of points and subsets X^{S_j}. We will keep x_i unchanged, but will move the remaining coordinates, in order to show that each point in the sequence belongs to the current and the subsequent subsets, moreover i will be the only essential coordinate on all X^{S_j}.

There are several steps. We start with pairs of coordinates j, k such that $i\,\mathbf{S}_a\,j, k$, and $j\,\mathbf{S}_a\,k$ but $k\,\mathbf{S}_b\,j$ (or vice versa). Note that both j, k are inessential in X^{S_a}. Let $j\,\mathbf{S}_a\,k$, and j, k be subsequent in $\mathbf{S}_a$, i.e. there is no m such that $j\,\mathbf{S}_a\,m\,\mathbf{S}_a\,k$. Such a pair must obviously exist. Using a simple argument, we can show that we can construct a point $x_i z^1_{-i}$ by changing z_j and z_k, such that $k\,\mathbf{E}^{x_i z'_{-i}}\,j$. Call this new ordering $\mathbf{S}_1$. By a density argument, we can show that if both j and k were not essential on X^{S_a}, they will not be essential on X^{S_1} either. Essentiality of all other coordinates is also not affected, so i remains the only essential coordinate on X^{S_1}. Note, that because $k\,\mathbf{E}^{x_i z'_{-i}}\,j$, we have $x_i z^1_{-i} \in X^{S_a}$, $x_i z^1_{-i} \in X^{S_1}$. Proceeding like this, we build a sequence $x_i z^j_{-i}$ until eventually all pairs j, k such that $i\,\mathbf{S}_a\,j$, $i\,\mathbf{S}_a\,k$ are ranked in the same order as in $\mathbf{S}_b$. Using the same approach, we repeat it for j, k such that $j\,\mathbf{S}_a\,i$, $k\,\mathbf{S}_a\,i$. Eventually, the sequence ends with an order $\mathbf{S}_n$.

It remains to switch the order of coordinates which change the relative position with i in $\mathbf{S}_a$ and $\mathbf{S}_b$. By using the closedness structural assumption, we can construct a point which will belongs both to X^{S_n} and X^{S_b}, and since i is the only essential coordinate on both sets, we obtain the result. □

Using this lemma, we can now define value functions $\phi_i(x_i) = F(x)$ by picking $x \in X^{S_a}$ where i is the essential coordinate. Lemma shows that the functions are well-defined. It remains to construct a capacity. We can do so, by letting $\alpha^a_i = 1$ for essential i and $\alpha^a_j = 0$ for the remaining coordinates. Points r^0 and r^1 can be used to show a result similar to Lemma 3. This means, that there exist a capacity ν, and the preference relation can be represented by a Choquet integral with respect to this capacity and value functions, defined as above.

An alternative construction is given in Section A.6.

8 Extending the representation to the extreme points of X

8.1 Definition value functions at maximal and minimal points of X_i

Due to a larger number of possible cases we can't easily show that all value functions are bounded on X_i as in Wakker [1991b]. Instead, we can show which functions are bounded on $X_i^{S_a}$. There can be two cases in which we do not know if ϕ_i is bounded on $X_i^{S_a}$. For maximal points these cases are:

- $\max X_i^{S_a} = \max X_i$, or
- $M_i^a := \max X_i^{S_a}$ and $M_i^a z_{-i} \in X_i^{S_a}$ only if for some $j \neq i$, we have $z_j = \max X_j$.

Lemma 8. *Let i be essential on X^{S_a} which has two or more essential variables. Let M_i^a be the maximal element of $X_i^{S_a}$. Then, ϕ_i is bounded on $X_i^{S_a}$ if either:*

1. *Exists y and z_{-i}, such that $y, M_i^a z_{-i} \in X^{S_a}$ and $y \succcurlyeq M_i z_{-i}$, or*
2. *i is in the same interaction clique as variable j, for which the first option applies.*

Proof. We start from the first case. We would need to construct y' and z'_{-i}, such that they do not contain any minimal or maximal points, and still $y' \succcurlyeq M_i^a z'_{-i}$. Assume z_{-i} contain some maximal points. All coordinates can't be maximal by monotonicity. Find $\mathbf{S}^a$-minimal j, such that z_j is maximal in $X_j^{S_a}$ (in can be also maximal in X_j or not), but for all coordinates k, such that $j \, \mathbf{S}^{M_i^a z_{-i}} \, k$ (note the superscript, point can belong to more than one X^{S_a} in case if some coordinates are in $\mathbf{E}$), we have that z_k is not maximal in $X_k^{S_a}$. We can slightly decrease z_j, finding $z'_j \preccurlyeq_j z_j$, such that $M_i z_{-ij} z'_j \in X^{S_a}$. By monotonicity still $y \succcurlyeq M_i z_{-ij} z'_j$. Proceeding in a similar way we can construct z'_{-i} not containing any maximal points. If it contains minimal points as well, we can increase them, starting with the $\mathbf{S}^a$-maximal one, staying in X^{S_a} and keeping the relation $y \succcurlyeq M_i z_{-ij} z'_j$ (see Lemma 16). Similarly, we can replace all maximal and minimal coordinates of y.

Now we have $y' \succcurlyeq M_i z'_{-i}$ and neither y', nor z'_{-i} contain any extreme coordinates. We can therefore conclude, that by monotonicity for every $w_i \in X_i^{S_a}$, we have $\phi_i(w_i) < \phi(y') - \sum_{j \neq i} \alpha_j \phi_j(z'_j)$, which shows that ϕ_i is bounded from above on $X_i^{S_a}$.

The second case relies on Lemma 4. It is easy to see that if y, such that $y \succcurlyeq M_i z_{-i}$, does not exist, we must not be able to increase any of coordinates z_{-i}, otherwise doing so would give us such y by monotonicity. It also implies, that all other essential variables are in the same interaction clique as i, otherwise we would be able to change them and again obtain a y. Finally, it means that S_a-maximal coordinate has a maximal value, and relations between all interacting coordinates are $\mathbf{E}$ (since we are not able neither to decrease, nor to increase any coordinate). Thus, we can use Lemma 4 and conclude that ϕ_i has an upper bound on $X_i^{S_a}$.

□

Having proved Lemma 8, we can now define $\phi(M_i) := \lim_{z_i \to M_i} \phi_i(z_i)$, and $\phi(m_i) := \lim_{z_i \to m_i} \phi_i(z_i)$ for all $i \in N$. Assigning values to minimal elements of X_i can be done in a similar manner. Finally we can prove the final theorem.

8.2 Global representation on the whole X

Theorem 8. *For any $x, y \in X$, we have $x \succcurlyeq y \iff \phi(x) \succcurlyeq \phi(y)$.*

Proof. We proceed as in Wakker [1991b] (Lemma 21) with some modifications. For points that do not contain any maximal or minimal coordinates, this has been already proved (Section 7). Thus, assume that x or y contain maximal or minimal coordinates. Let $x \succcurlyeq y$, and let $x \in X^{S_a}, y \in X^{S_b}$. Find S_a-minimal j such that x_j is maximal. We can also assume that for all k, such that $j \, \mathbf{S}_a \, k$, we have $j \, \mathbf{S}^x \, k$. If this is not the case, then x belongs to several X^{S_i} (by definition of these sets), and there must be one where this condition holds. By Lemma 16 we can find $x'_j : x_j \succcurlyeq_j x'_j$ such that $x'_j x_{-j} \in X^{S_a}$ and still $x'_j x_{-j} \succ y$. Proceeding like this we get x' which does not contain any maximal coordinates, and $x' \succ y$. We now need to show that $\phi(x') > \phi(y)$. Similarly, we can replace minimal coordinates of y, and so it is now required to show that $\phi(x') > \phi(y')$. So we can assume that x has no maximal and y has no minimal coordinates. x must have a non-minimal X^{S_a}-essential coordinate, find a S_a-maximal one i. Again, we can assume that for all k, such that $j \, \mathbf{S}_a \, k$, we have $j \, \mathbf{S}^x \, k$. ;By Lemma 16 we can decrease it slightly and find $x'_i : x_i \succ x'_i$ and $x'_i x_{-i} \in X^{S_a}$ and still $x' := x'_i x_{-i} \succ y$. So we need to show now only that $\phi(x') \geq \phi(y)$. If we replace all minimal coordinates of x' by non-minimal ones and all maximal coordinates of y by non-maximal ones, then by monotonicity the preference between them is not affected, and by Lemma 6, we have $\phi(x') > \phi(y)$. Thus any small increase of minimal and small decrease of maximal values leads to a strict inequality. By definition of ϕ_i at extreme elements of X_i, we have that $\phi(x')$ is the infimum of all such ϕ-values, and $\phi(y)$ is the supremum. Hence, $\phi(x') \succcurlyeq \phi(y)$. $x \succcurlyeq y \Rightarrow \phi(x) \succcurlyeq \phi(y)$ also implies $\phi(x) \geq \phi(y) \Rightarrow x \succcurlyeq y$.

Now let $\phi(x) > \phi(y)$. x cannot have all it's essential coordinates minimal, so find S_a-maximal j, such that x_j is not minimal. By denserangedness of ϕ_j, we can find a non-minimal $x'_j : x_j \succ_j x'_j$ and still $\phi(x'_j x_{-j}) > \phi(y)$. By the above argument, we have $x'_j x_{-j} \succcurlyeq y$, and by strict monotonicity we have $x \succ y$. □

9 Uniqueness

When defining functions ϕ_i we set $\phi_i(r_i^0) = 0$ and $\phi_i(r_i^1) = 1$ for all i. This can be relaxed, in fact for every interaction clique $A \in N$, we can choose the origin and scaling factor independently.

Changing the origin alone would not alter the capacity, but changing the scaling factor would. For example, let us define, as previously, $\phi'_i(r_i^0) = 0$ for all $i \in N$, but set $\phi'_i(r_i^1) = 1$ for $i \notin A$ and $\phi'_j(r_j^1) = t_A$ for $j \in A$, so now $\alpha_j^{a'} = t_A \alpha_j^a$ for some $j \in A$. Accordingly, when normalizing coefficients $\alpha_i^{a'}$ in the additive representations, we will be dividing by $\sum_{i \notin A} \alpha_i^a + t_A \sum_{i \in A} \alpha_i^a$.

It is not hard to see, that the $A - NA$ lemma (Lemma 3) is still intact - indeed, sums of $\alpha_i^{a'}$ within each clique remain the same, just scaled by some common factor - $(\sum_{i \notin A} \alpha_i^a + t_A \sum_{i \in A} \alpha_i^a)$ for $\alpha_i^{a'}, i \notin A$, and $t_A(\sum_{i \notin A} \alpha_i^a + t_A \sum_{i \in A} \alpha_i^a)$ for $\alpha_j^{a'}, j \in A$.

It is also not hard to show that equivalence classes would still have identical values in different X^{S_a} after such operation. The following Lemmas prepare this.

Lemma 9. *Let $A_1, A_2, ...$ be interaction cliques of N. Then, for any $B : B \cap A_i \neq \emptyset, B \cap A_j \neq \emptyset$, we have $m(B) = 0$. Also, if for two sets A_1 and A_2 we have $m(B) = 0$ for all $B : B \cap A_1 \neq \emptyset, B \cap A_2 \neq \emptyset$, then coordinates from A_1 do not interact with coordinates from A_2.*

Proof. It's enough to show this for singletons. Let $i \in A_1$ and $j \in A_2$. We need to show that for any $B : i, j \in B$, we have $m(B) = 0$, and vice versa, if $m(B) = 0$ for every such B, then i and j do not interact. Assume that for some such B we have $m(B) \neq 0$. Then, we can find $x_{ij}z_{-ij} \in X^{S_a}$, $y_{ij}z_{-ij} \in X^{S_b}$, such that $\alpha^a_k = \alpha^b_k$ for all $k \neq i, j$, and $\alpha^a_i \neq \alpha^b_i, \alpha^a_j \neq \alpha^b_j$. This implies that ij-trade-off consistency does not hold on all X_{ij}, hence the variables interact. To show the reverse, note that we have $\alpha^a_i = \alpha^b_i, \alpha^a_j = \alpha^b_j$ for all possible points in X, which implies ij-trade-off consistency on all X_{ij}. □

The following two Lemmas follow trivially.

Lemma 10. $\sum_{B \subset A_i} m(B) \geq 0$ *for all interaction cliques A_i.*

Lemma 11. *Let $A_1, A_2, ...$ be interaction cliques of N. Then the Choquet integral wrt a corresponding ν,, can be written as a sum of integrals wrt "sub-capacities", defined on sets of all subsets of A_i.*

Consequently, we can substitute ϕ_i for $k_A\psi_i$ for all $i \in A$, and re-normalize the capacity by multiplying every $m(A)$, hence also $\nu(A)$ by $\sum_{B \not\in A} m(B) + k_A \sum B \in A m(B)$. Apparently, this implies that points from different X^{S_a} belonging to the same equivalence class would still have identical values.

Uniqueness properties of the value functions are similar to those obtained in the homogeneous case $X = Y^n$, but are modified to accommodate for the heterogeneous structure of the set X in this paper. Because of our general setup, value functions might admit "ordinal" transformations at certain points, and "cardinal" at the others, even within the same coordinate. In particular, if a point x_i belongs to some $X_i^{S_a}$, and X^{S_a} has two or more essential coordinates, one of which is i, then $\phi_i(x_i)$ admits only a cardinal transformation, unless an extreme case applies, when $x_i z_{-i} \in X^{S_a}$ for a single z_{-i}. Two dimensional case is much more transparent to understanding, and the general idea remains intact.

Let $\mathcal{I} = \{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$ be a set of interaction cliques of N. Obviously, I is a partition of N.

Lemma 12. *Let $g_1 : X_1 \to \mathbb{R}, \ldots, g_n : X_n \to \mathbb{R}$ be such that (1) holds with f_i substituted by g_i. Then, at all $x_i \in X_i$, such that for more than one z_{-i} we have $x_i z_{-i} \in X^{S_a}$, where X^{S_a} has two essential coordinates, one of which is i, value functions f_i and g_i are related in the following way:*

$$f_i(x_i) = \alpha_{A_j} g_i(x_i) + \beta_{A_j},$$

Capacity changes as follows

$$m'(B) = \frac{\alpha_{A_j} m(B)}{\sum_{C \subset A_i, A_i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{A_i} m(C)}.$$

At the remaining points of X, value functions f_i have the following uniqueness properties:

$$f_i(x_i) = \psi_i(g_i(x_i)),$$

where ψ_i is an increasing function, and for all $j \in N, j \neq i$, such that exists $A \in N : i, j \in A, m(A) > 0$, we additionally have

$$f_i(x_i) = f_j(x_j) \iff g_i(x_i) = g_j(x_j).$$

Proof. Mostly follows from uniqueness properties of additive and ordinal representations and Lemma 4. The only complication is the special case, when $x_i z_{-i} \in X^{S_a}$ for a unique z_{-i}. This effectively means that $x_i z_{-i}$ is the only representative of its equivalence class in X^{S_a}, hence it must be maximal or minimal. It also implies, that the transformation of $\phi_i(x_i)$ does not have to be the same as for all other points in $X_i^{S_a}$, as the only condition it has to satisfy is that $\phi(x_i z_{-i})$ has to be greater (or less) than values of all other equivalence classes in X^{S_a}. □

Appendix

A.1 Technical lemmas

Lemma 13. *If $\succcurlyeq$ satisfies triple cancellation then it is independent.*

Proof. $a_i p_{-i} \preccurlyeq a_i p_{-i}, a_i q_{-i} \succcurlyeq a_i q_{-i}, a_i p_{-i} \succcurlyeq b_i p_{-i} \Rightarrow a_i q_{-i} \succcurlyeq b_i q_{-i}$. □

Lemma 14. $X = \bigcup X^{S_i}$.

Proof. Immediate by **A3**. □

Definition 11. *For any set I of consecutive integers, a set $\{g_i^k : g_i^k \in X_i, k \in I\}$ is a* standard sequence *on coordinate i if exist z_{-ij}, y_j^0, y_j^1 such that $y_j^0 \not\sim_j y_j^1$ and for all $i, i+1 \in I$ we have $g_i^k y_j^1 z_{-ij} \sim g_i^{k+1} y_j^0 z_{-ij}$. Further, we say that $\{g_i^k : k \in I\}$* is contained *in X^{S_a} if z_{-ij}, y_j^0, y_j^1 can be chosen in such a way, that all resulting points are in X^{S_a}.*

Lemma 15. *Axiom **A5** implies the following condition. Let $\{g_i^k : k \in I\}$ and $\{h_j^k : k \in I\}$ be two standard sequences, each contained in some X^{S_a}. Assume also, that for some $m \in I$, $g_i^m y_l^0 z_{-il} \sim h_j^m w_n^0 x_{-jn}$ and $g_i^{m+1} y_l^0 z_{-il} \sim h_j^{m+1} w_n^0 x_{-jn}$. Then, for all $k \in I$, $g_i^k y_l^0 z_{-il} \sim h_j^k w_n^0 x_{-jn}$.*

Proof. The proof is very similar to the one from [Krantz et al., 1971] (Lemma 5 in section 8.3.1). Assume wlog that $\{g_i^k : k \in I, g_i^k y_l^1 z_{-il} \sim g_i^{k+1} y_l^0 z_{-il}\}$ is an increasing standard sequence on i, which is contained in X^{S_a}, whereas $\{h_j^k : h_j^k w_n^1 x_{-jn} \sim h^{k+1} w_n^0 x_{-jn}\}$ is an increasing standard sequence on j, and lies entirely in X^{S_b}. We will show that $g_i^{m+2} y_l^0 z_{-il} \sim h_j^{m+2} w_n^0 x_{-jn}$ from which everything follows by induction.

Assume $h_j^{m+2} w_n^0 x_{-jn} \succ g_i^{m+2} y_l^0 z_{-il}$. Then, by restricted solvability exists $\hat{h}_j \in X_j$ such

that $\hat{h}_j w_n^0 x_{-jn} \sim g_i^{m+2} y_l^0 z_{-il}$. By **A5**,

$$\left.\begin{array}{r} g_i^m y_l^1 z_{-il} \sim g_i^{m+1} y_l^0 z_{-il} \\ g_i^{m+1} y_l^1 z_{-il} \sim g_i^{m+2} y_l^0 z_{-il} \\ g_i^m y_l^0 z_{-il} \sim h_j^m w_n^0 x_{-jn} \\ g_i^{m+1} y_l^0 z_{-il} \sim h_j^{m+1} w_n^0 x_{-jn} \\ g_i^{m+1} y_l^0 z_{-il} \sim h_j^{m+1} w_n^0 x_{-jn} \\ g_i^{m+2} y_l^0 z_{-il} \sim \hat{h}_j w_n^0 x_{-jn} \\ h_j^m w_n^1 x_{-jn} \sim h_j^{m+1} w_n^0 x_{-jn} \end{array}\right\} \Rightarrow h_j^{m+1} w_n^1 x_{-jn} \sim \hat{h}_j w_n^0 x_{-jn}.$$

By definition of $\{h_j^k\}$, we have $h_j^{m+1} w_n^1 x_{-jn} \sim h_j^{m+2} w_n^0 x_{-jn}$. Thus, $h_j^{m+2} w_n^0 x_{-jn} \sim \hat{h}_j w_n^0 x_{-jn}$, hence also $g_i^{m+2} y_l^0 z_{-il} \sim h_j^{m+2} w_n^0 x_{-jn}$, a contradiction. The other cases are symmetrical. □

Lemma 16. *Let there be x, y, i such that $x \succ y$, $x \in X^{S_a}$, $i \mathbf{S}^x k$ for all $k : i \mathbf{S}_a k$, and x_i is non-minimal if i is minimal in $\mathbf{S}_a$. Then exists z_i, such that $z_i \succcurlyeq_i x_i$, $i \mathbf{S}^{z_i x_{-i}} k$ for all $k : i \mathbf{S}_a k$, and $z_i x_{-i} \succ y$. Similarly, let there be x, y, i such that $y \succ x$, $x \in X^{S_a}$, $k \mathbf{S}^x i$ for all $k : k \mathbf{S}_a i$, and x_i is non-maximal if i is maximal in $\mathbf{S}_a$. Then exists z_i, such that $x_i \succcurlyeq_i z_i$, $k \mathbf{S}^{z_i x_{-i}} i$ for all $k : k \mathbf{S}_a i$, and $y \succ z_i x_{-i}$.*

Proof. By restricted solvability and monotonicity. See Wakker [1991b] Lemma 11. □

A.2 Essentiality and monotonicity

In what follows the essentiality of coordinates within various X^{S_i} is critical. The central mechanism to guarantee consistency in the number of essential coordinates within various X^{S_i} is bi-independence, which is closely related to comonotonic strong monotonicity of Wakker [1989].

In the Choquet integral representation problem for a heterogeneous product set $X = X_1 \times \ldots \times X_n$, strong monotonicity is actually a necessary condition. It is directly implied by **A6** - bi-independence, together with the structural assumption.

Lemma 17. *Pointwise monotonicity. If for all $i \in N$ it holds $x_i \succcurlyeq_i y_i$, then $x \succcurlyeq y$.*

Proof. $x \succcurlyeq y_1 x_{-1} \succcurlyeq y_{12} x_{-12} \succcurlyeq \ldots \succcurlyeq y$. □

Lemma 18. *If i is essential on X^{S_a}, then $a_i \succcurlyeq_i b_i$ iff $a_i x_{-i} \succ b_i x_{-i}$ for all $a_i x_{-i}, b_i x_{-i} \in X^{S_a}$.*

Proof. If $a_i \succcurlyeq_i b_i$ then by the structural assumption exists $a_i z_{-i} \succ b_i z_{-i}$. The result follows by bi-independence (**A6**). □

Conceptually, Lemma 18 implies that if a coordinate i is essential on some subset of X^{S_a}, then it is also essential on the whole X^{S_a}. This allows us to make statements like "coordinate i is essential on X^{S_a}".

A.3 Equispaced sequences

A usual standard sequence goes along a single dimension as defined above. In this paper we often require to move along several dimensions, one at a time, maintaining the increment between steps constant in some sense. In order to achieve this we will introduce the concept of *equispaced* sequences [4]. Figure 1 illustrates the process.



Figure 1: Equispaced sequences in two dimensions

Assume that r^0, r^1 are such that $i\,\mathbf{R}^{r^0}\,j$ and $i\,\mathbf{R}^{r^1}\,j$. We would like to build a sequence from r^0 to r^1 staying in the area where $i\,\mathbf{R}\,j$. We can choose the size of the sequence step arbitrarily. However, the problem is that r^1 does not have an equivalent point with the second coordinate equal to r_j^0, so we cannot build a "normal" standard sequence to achieve that. Our aim is to maintain the sequence within set where $i\,\mathbf{R}\,j$. We also assume that X_i and X_j do not have maximal or minimal elements (or they have been removed).

By density and the absence of maximal and minimal elements, we can find $\alpha_i^k, \alpha_i^{k+1}$ such that $\alpha_i^{k+1} \succcurlyeq_i r_i^1 \succcurlyeq_i \alpha_i^k$. We need to change the direction of the sequence from the dimension i to the dimension j at r_i^1. We construct a point equivalent to a_i^k and a point equivalent to a_i^{k+1} such that their i's coordinate is r_i^1 (points γ_j^k and γ_j^{k+1}). Since we can choose the step of the sequence arbitrarily, by density and absence of maximal elements, we can move on and construct a standard sequence on the coordinate j using these two points.

Remarkably the spacing between subsequent members of the equispaced sequence $\alpha^1, \ldots, \alpha^{k-1}, \gamma^k, \gamma^{k+1}, \ldots$ stays in a certain sense the same, no matter along which dimension we are moving. Once an additive interval scale is constructed, the vague notion of the equal spacing will convert into a clear constant difference of values for subsequent members of the sequence.

[4] See also [Bouyssou and Marchant, 2010] for a similar idea

Extension of A5 to equispaced sequences Construction of equispaced sequences allows us to extend the statement of **A5**, and more precisely that of Lemma 15 to equispaced sequences.

Lemma 19. *If g^k and h^k are two equispaced sequences entirely lying in X^{S_a} and X^{S_b} correspondingly, and for some i we have $g^i \sim h^i$ and $g^{i+1} \sim h^{i+1}$, then for all j such that exist g^j and h^j we have $g^j \sim h^j$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality assume that $g^i := g^i_k g_{-k}$ and $g^{i+1} := g^{i+1}_k g_{-k}$, while $h^i := h^i_l h_{-l}$ and $h^{i+1} := h^{i+1}_l h_{-l}$, i.e. in both cases the points are from subsequences on the same dimensions. Assume further, that $h^{i+2} := h^{i+2}_l h_{-l}$ and $g^{i+2} := g^{i+2}_m g'_{-m}$, i.e. there is a change of dimension in the sequence g^k. We will show that this entails that the following steps of the equispaced sequence g^k will be equivalent to the corresponding steps of the sequence h^k as long as both keep going along dimensions m and l correspondingly. If either of them changes its direction the technique can be applied again. We have by construction (see Figure 1) $g^{i+2}_k g_{-k} \sim g^{i+2}_m g'_{-m}$ and $g^{i+3}_k g_{-k} \sim g^{i+3}_m g'_{-m}$. Therefore, $g^{i+2}_m g'_{-m} \sim h^{i+2}_l h_{-l}$ and $g^{i+3}_m g'_{-m} \sim h^{i+3}_l h_{-l}$. The statement follows by Lemma 15 (**A5**). □

A.4 Necessity of axioms

Lemma 20. ***A3*** *is necessary.*

Proof. At any point $z \in X$ and for every i, j, we must have either $f_i(z_i) \geq g_i(z_i)$ or $g_i(z_i) \geq f_i(z_i)$. From this everything follows trivially (write the condition using Mobius representation of the integral). □

Lemma 21. ***A6*** *is necessary.*

Proof. Assume $a_i x_{-i}, b_i x_{-i}, c_i x_{-i}, d_i x_{-i} \in X^{S_a}$ and $a_i x_{-i} \succ b_i x_{-i}, c_i x_{-i} \sim d_i x_{-i}, c_i y_{-i} \succ d_i y_{-i}$. There can be three cases:

1. $c_i y_{-i}, d_i y_{-i} \in X^{S_b}$. We have additive representations on X^{S_a} and X^{S_b}, so

$$\alpha_i f_i(a_i) + \sum_{j \in N \setminus i} \alpha_j f_j(x_j) > \alpha_i f_i(b_i) + \sum_{j \in N \setminus i} \alpha_j f_j(x_j)$$
$$\alpha_i f_i(c_i) + \sum_{j \in N \setminus i} \alpha_j f_j(x_j) = \alpha_i f_i(d_i) + \sum_{j \in N \setminus i} \alpha_j f_j(x_j)$$
$$\beta_i f_i(c_i) + \sum_{j \in N \setminus i} \beta_j f_j(y_j) > \beta_i f_i(d_i) + \sum_{j \in N \setminus i} \beta_j f_j(y_j).$$

The first inequality entails $\alpha_i \neq 0$. From this and the following equality follows $f_i(c_i) = f_i(d_i)$, which contradicts with the last inequality. Thus $c_i y_{-i} \succ d_i y_{-i}$ implies $c_i x_{-i} \succ d_i x_{-i}$ but only in the presence of $a_i x_{-i} \succ b_i x_{-i}$ in the same X^{S_a} (the case when $c_i y_{-i}$ and $d_i y_{-i}$ are not both in the same X^{S_b} can be reduced to this one. This is also the reason behind the name we gave to this condition - "weak bi-independence".

2. $c_i y_{-i}, d_i y_{-i} \in X^{S_a}$. In this case we get $\alpha_i f_i(c_i) > \alpha_i f_i(d_i)$ and $\alpha_i f_i(c_i) = \alpha_i f_i(d_i)$, a contradiction.

3. $c_i y_{-i} \in X^{S_a}, d_i y_{-i} \in X^{S_b}$. As above $\alpha_i \neq 0$, so it follows that $f_i(a_i) = f_i(b_i)$. But then we must have $d_i y_{-i} \in X^{S_a}$ (value functions are all equal to those for $c_i y_{-i}$), and hence the conclusion follows as in the previous case. □

A.5 Shape of $\{z_{ij} : i \,\mathbf{E}^z\, j\}$

Shape of the boundary between subsets of X_{ij} where $i \,\mathbf{R}\, j$ and $j \,\mathbf{R}\, i$ is an interesting and important question. Axiom **A3** only guarantees that this boundary is in a certain sense "quasiconvex", i.e. an increase along i cannot be matched by a decrease along j. Strengthening this statement requires invoking other axioms.

A.5.1 Every X^{S_i} has one essential variable

Assume that every X^{S_i} has only one essential variable. We will show that an increase along i must be matched by an *increase* along j. This is actually required to construct a representation (see Section 7.1). The main axiom, required to show this in addition to **A3** is strong monotonicity (**A6**).

Lemma 22. *Let $a_i p_j$ be such that $i \,\mathbf{E}^{a_i p_j z_{-ij}}\, j$. Then, unless i and j do not interact, for no b_i we can have $i \,\mathbf{E}^{b_i p_j z_{-ij}}\, j$.*

Proof. Assume such b_i exists. Moreover, assume, wlog, that $a_i \succcurlyeq_i b_i$, and we took maximal a_i and minimal b_i for which this holds.

1. If b_i is minimal in X_i and a_i is maximal in X_i, then i, j do not interact by **A3**, so assume that b_i is not minimal (the other case is symmetric).

2. Since we took the smallest b_i for which $i \,\mathbf{E}^{b_i p_j z_{-ij}}\, j$, we can assume wlog (other cases are similar) that exists $c_i \preccurlyeq_i b_i$, such that $b_i q_j z_{-ij} \succ c_i q_j z_{-ij}$, and $b_i p_j z_{-ij} \sim c_i p_j z_{-ij}$ (a violation of ij-independence, required by the presence of interaction).

3. By density assumption there must exist $s_j : i \,\mathbf{E}^{c_i s_j z_{-ij}}$.

4. We have $b_i p_j z_{-ij} \succ c_i s_j z_{-ij}$, hence $c_i p_j z_{-ij} \succ c_i s_j z_{-ij}$.

5. Now we need to extend $X^{S_a} \supset c_i q_j z_{-ij}$ "to the right", so that $X_i^{S_a} \supset d_i : d_i \succ_i b_i$. We also need to extend $X^{S_b} \supset b_i p_j z_{-ij}$, so that $X_j^{S_b} \supset t_j : t_j \succ_j p_j$. This can be done by adjusting particular coordinates of z_{ij}. Assume, that z_{ij} is already such, that the above conditions hold. In the case when such adjustment cannot be performed, we might need to perform a similar extension "to the left" from $d_i p_j z_{-ij}$.

6. Note that on $\mathbf{SE}_{ij}^{c_i q_j z_{-ij}}$ we can either have i essential, or neither i nor j, whereas on $\mathbf{NW}_{ij}^{a_i p_j z_{-ij}}$ it can either be j, or none as well.

7. The point of the extensions is to show that by strong monotonicity **A6**, we must have $d_i p_j z_{-ij} \succ b_i p_j z_{-ij}$, as i is essential on $\mathbf{SE}_{ij}^{c_i q_j z_{-ij}}$, but also $d_i p_j z_{-ij} \sim b_i p_j z_{-ij}$, as i is inessential on $\mathbf{NW}_{ij}^{a_i p_j z_{-ij}}$. If an extension "to the left" was performed, we must get $c_i s_j z_{-ij} \sim b_i p_j z_{-ij}$, but also $b_i p_j z_{-ij} \succ c_i s_j z_{-ij}$, as j stays essential.

□

A.5.2 X^{S_i} have two or more essential variables

In section 7 we have shown, that in the representation value functions for sets X_i and X_j are equal for points z where $i\,\mathbf{E}^z\,j$. Theorem 9 provides a qualitative version of this statement. The assumption we must make is that i and j are essential on X^{S_a} and X^{S_b}, such that S_a and S_b differ only with respect to order of i and j. In the below proof, we assume that i, j are S_a and S_b-maximal, but this can be easily changed, by starting from some $r^1_A r^0_{-A}$ instead of r^0.

Theorem 9. *Let $r^0 : i\,\mathbf{E}^{r^1}\,j, r^1 : i\,\mathbf{E}^{r^1}\,j$ and a^k_i and b^k_j are two standard sequences such that $a^0_i r^0_{-i} \sim r^0_i r^0_{-i}$ and $b^0_j r^0_{-j} \sim r^0_j r^0_{-j}$ and $r^1_i r^0_{-i} \sim a^m_i r^0_{-i}$ whereas $r^1_j r^0_{-j} \sim b^m_j r^0_{-j}$. Assume r^2 is such that $i\,\mathbf{E}^{r^2}\,j$ and $r^2_i r^0_{-i} \sim a^n_i r^0_{-i}$. Then $r^2_j r^0_{-j} \sim b^n_j r^0_{-j}$.*

Proof. Build two equispaced sequences from r^0 to $r^1_{ij} r^0_{-ij}$:

- e^k starting from r^0_i via $r^1_i r^0_{-i}$, and
- w^k starting from r^0_j via $r^1_j r^0_{-j}$,

such that $e^1_i r^0_{-i} \sim w^1_j r^0_{-j}$. By Lemma 15 (**A5**) it follows then that all corresponding steps of two sequences are equivalent, in other words, $e^k \sim w^k$ for all k. Consequently, there is the same number of steps both sequences make between r^0 and $r^1_{ij} r^0_{-ij}$, say K.

For some $s < K$ we have $r^1_i r^0_{-i}$ lying between e^s and e^{s+1}, i.e. $e^{s+1} \succ r^1_i r^0_{-i} \succcurlyeq e^s$. Similarly, for some $t < K$ we have $w^{t+1} \succ r^1_j r^0_{-j} \succcurlyeq w^t$. We can write:

$$[r^0, r^1_i r^0_{-i}] \approx n a^k_i \approx s e^k,$$

which means: $r^1_i r^0_i$ lies between $a^n_i r^0_{-i}$ and $a^{n+1}_i r^0_{-i}$ and also between e^s and e^{s+1}. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
[r^0, r^1_j r^0_{-j}] &\approx n b^k_j \approx t w^k \\
[r^1_i r^0_{-i}, r^1_{ij} r^0_{-ij}] &\approx n b^k_j \approx (K-s) e^k \\
[r^1_j r^0_{-j}, r^1_{ij} r^0_{-ij}] &\approx n a^k_i \approx (K-t) w^k.
\end{aligned}$$

Two last statements are possible because by density we can can get arbitrarily close to points $r^1_j r^0_{-j}$ and $r^1_i r^0_{-i}$ by choosing finer sequences e^k and w^k.

For point $r^2_{ij} r^0_{-ij}$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
[r^0, r^2_i r^0_{-i}] &\approx m a^k_i \approx \frac{m}{n} s e^k \\
[r^2_j r^0_{-j}, r^2_{ij} r^0_{-ij}] &\approx m a^k_i \approx \frac{m}{n} (K-t) w^k.
\end{aligned}$$

Assume that the number of steps on two other segments is different:

$$\begin{aligned}
[r^0, r^2_j r^0_{-j}] &\approx l b^k_j \approx \frac{l}{n} t w^k \\
[r^2_i r^0_{-i}, r^2_{ij} r^0_{-ij}] &\approx l b^k_j \approx \frac{l}{n} (K-s) e^k.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing up parts for both paths to $r^2_{ij}r^0_{-ij}$ we get $\frac{ms+l(K-s)}{n}e^k$ for $\mathbf{SE}_{ij}$ and $\frac{m(K-t)+lt}{n}w^k$ for $\mathbf{NW}_{ij}$. By Lemma 15 (**A5**) the number of steps must be identical, so:

$$\frac{ms+l(K-s)}{n} = \frac{m(K-t)+lt}{n},$$

or

$$m(s+t-K) = l(s+t-K).$$

There are two possible solutions:

- $m = l$, and
- $t = K - s$, which means that trade-offs are consistent throughout X, hence i and j do not interact, a contradiction.

The result follows. □

Corollary 1. *If $a_ip_j : i\,\mathbf{E}^{a_ip_jz_{-ij}}\,j$ and $b_ip_j : i\,\mathbf{E}^{b_ip_jz_{-ij}}\,j$, then $x_iy_j : i\,\mathbf{E}^{x_iy_jz_{-ij}}\,j$ for all $x_i \in X_i$, $y_j \in Y_j$.*

Corollary 2. *If $a_ip_j : i\,\mathbf{E}^{a_ip_jz_{-ij}}\,j$, then*

- *for any b_i, such that $b_i \succcurlyeq_i a_i$ we have $i\,\mathbf{S}^{b_ip_jz_{-ij}}\,j$,*
- *for any b_i, such that $a_i \succcurlyeq_i b_i$ we have $j\,\mathbf{S}^{b_ip_jz_{-ij}}\,i$,*
- *for any q_j, such that $q_j \succcurlyeq_j p_j$ we have $j\,\mathbf{S}^{a_iq_jz_{-ij}}\,i$,*
- *for any q_j, such that $p_j \succcurlyeq_j q_j$ we have $i\,\mathbf{S}^{a_iq_jz_{-ij}}\,j$.*

or i, j do not interact.

A.6 Alternative treatment of the case with single essential variables

For this case we can also construct the representation as follows. We will define value functions for all sets X_i in accordance with $\succcurlyeq_i$. We would additionally require that $\phi_i(x_i) \geq \phi_j(x_j)$ iff $i\,\mathbf{R}^{x_ix_jz_{-ij}}\,j$. Finally, we will prove a lemma, similar to Lemma 3, which would allow us to construct a capacity and the Choquet integral.

We start by considering if we can define value functions on X_i according to the rules defined in the previous paragraph. Since $\succcurlyeq_i$ is a weak order, we can obviously define functions such that $\phi_i(x_i) \geq \phi_j(x_j)$ iff $x_i \succcurlyeq_i y_i$. However, the second condition is more complicated. One particular case, when this would be impossible, is if exist $x_ix_jz_{-ij}$ and $y_ix_jz_{-ij}$ such that $i\,\mathbf{E}^{x_ix_jz_{-ij}}\,j$ and $i\,\mathbf{E}^{y_ix_jz_{-ij}}\,j$. However, this would eventually imply that once the representation is constructed we have $f_i(x_i) = f_i(y_i)$, and hence $C(\nu, f(x_iz_{-i})) = C(\nu, f(y_iz_{-i}))$ for any z_{-i}, which implies $x_iz_{-i} \sim y_iz_{-i}$ for all z_{-i}. This in turn contradicts a structural assumption that we have made. We state the following lemma:

Lemma 23. *Assume that i and j interact. Then, if $i\,\mathbf{E}^{x_ix_jz_{-ij}}\,j$, then for no $y_ix_jz_{-ij}$ holds $i\,\mathbf{E}^{y_ix_jz_{-ij}}\,j$.*

Proof. By **A3** and strong monotonicity **A6**. See Lemma 22 in the appendix for details. □

Next, we will use this to show that for interacting variables $\mathbf{R}$ is transitive.

Lemma 24. *Let i, j and j, k interact. Then, $i\,\mathbf{R}^z\,j$ and $j\,\mathbf{R}^z\,k$ imply $i\,\mathbf{R}^z\,k$.*

Proof. If i and k do not interact, the the result is immediate, hence, assume that they interact. Also, if we have $i\,\mathbf{S}^z\,j$ and $j\,\mathbf{S}^z$, then by acylicity $i\,\mathbf{R}^z\,k$, so one of the relations must be a $\mathbf{E}^z$.

Assume first that $i\,\mathbf{E}^z\,j, j\,\mathbf{S}^z\,k$. Assume also $k\,\mathbf{S}^z\,i$. We want to increase z_i slightly, so that for some $x_i \succcurlyeq_i z_i$ we have $i\,\mathbf{S}^{x_i z_{-i}}\,j$, but still $k\,\mathbf{S}^{x_i z_{-i}}\,i$, which leads to a violation of acyclicity. This is possible by density, unless z_i is maximal. In this case, decrease z_j slightly, so that for $x_j : z_j \succcurlyeq x_j$ we have $i\,\mathbf{S}^{x_j z_{-j}}\,j$ but still $i\,\mathbf{S}^{x_j z_{-j}}\,k$. This is again possible unless z_j is minimal, in which case we conclude (z_i is maximal, z_j is minimal), that $ij - 3C$ holds for all x_i, x_j, hence i and j do not interact, a contradiction.

Similarly, assume $i\,\mathbf{S}^z\,j, j\,\mathbf{E}^z\,k, k\,\mathbf{S}^z\,i$. Increase z_i or decrease z_k to violate acyclicity, or otherwise conclude that j and k do not interact, as above.

Finally, assume $i\,\mathbf{E}^z\,j, j\,\mathbf{E}^z\,k, k\,\mathbf{S}^z\,i$. Increase z_i and decrease z_k to get $i\,\mathbf{S}^{x_{ik} z_{-ik}}\,j, j\,\mathbf{S}^{x_{ik} z_{-ik}}\,k, k\,\mathbf{S}^{x_{ik} z_{-ik}}\,i$, which violates acyclicity. If z_i is maximal, decrease z_k to get $i\,\mathbf{E}^{x_k z_{-k}}\,j, j\,\mathbf{S}^{x_k z_{-k}}\,k, k\,\mathbf{S}^{x_k z_{-k}}\,i$, which is the first case considered above. If z_i can be increased, but z_k is minimal, we obtain he second case above. Finally, if z_i is maximal and z_k is minimal, then by definition $i\,\mathbf{R}^z\,k$.

Since $\mathbf{R}$ is transitive it follows that for interacting variables $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{S}$ would also be transitive. □

Finally, we can construct value functions $\phi_i : X_i \to \mathbb{R}$. To do so, we start by constructing the function on any variable X_j. Since $\succcurlyeq_i$ is a weak order, this can obviously be done. Next, we construct the value function on X_k, such that j and k interact. This time, the function would also have to satisfy the second constraint - $\phi_k(x_k) \geq \phi_j(x_j)$ iff $k\,\mathbf{R}^{x_k x_j z_{-kj}}\,j$. Then the construction proceeds to some X_l, such that l and j or l and k interact. We continue like this, until all variables in the interaction clique, containing j do not have value functions defined. After this, variables from all other interaction cliques can be defined in the same way.

Assume, that we have already defined some value functions, in a manner, consistent with the constraints above, and want to define ϕ_i. A contradiction can occur, if at some stage we get $i\,\mathbf{R}^z\,j$ but $\phi_j(z_j) > \phi_i(z_i)$. This can happen, if i is interacting with more than one variable, and we used some other value function ϕ_k to define ϕ_i. However, we can update value functions throughout the clique to resolve this violation.

For any $\phi_i(x_i)$ we have either:

1. $\phi_i(x_i) = \phi_k(x_k)$ for some x_k in X_k, or
2. $\phi_i(x_i) > \phi_k(x_k)$ for all x_k in X_k, or
3. $\phi_i(x_i) < \phi_k(x_k)$ for all x_k in X_k.

Same holds for every other interacting pair of variables, apart from i, j, for which the value functions have already been constructed.

Since we have $\phi_j(z_j) > \phi_i(z_i)$, but $i \,\mathbf{R}^z\, j$, in order to resolve the conflict, we need to increase $\phi_i(z_i)$ and decrease $\phi_j(z_j)$. Since value functions are ordinal, we can do this by applying some increasing transformation to them. If it is the case that $\phi_i(z_i) > \phi_k(x_k)$ for all x_k in X_k, this can be done straightforwardly. However, if it is the case that $\phi_i(z_i) = \phi_k(z_k)$ or $\phi_i(z_i) < \phi_k(x_k)$ for all x_k in X_k, we will have to change ϕ_k as well. Eventually, either the conflict is resolved, i.e. value functions are sufficiently adjusted, or we find some common "predecessor" - a coordinate m and build a chain like the one below:

$$\phi_i(z_i) \leq \phi_k(x_k) \leq \phi_l(x_l) \leq \ldots \leq \phi_o(x_o) \leq \phi_m(x_m),$$

where each point is taken so that it is minimal with respect to the predecessor, for example in pair $\phi_i(z_i) \leq \phi_k(x_k)$ we pick x_k such that for no y_k we have $\phi_i(z_i) \leq \phi_k(y_k) \leq \phi_k(x_k)$. Similarly, for $\phi_j(z_j)$ we get the following chain:

$$\phi_j(z_j) \geq \phi_s(w_s) \geq \phi_t(w_t) \geq \ldots \geq \phi_m(w_m).$$

If now $\phi_m(w_m) > \phi_m(x_m)$, we get

$$\phi_j(z_j) \geq \phi_s(w_s) \geq \phi_t(w_t) \geq \ldots \geq \phi_m(w_m) > \phi_m(x_m) \geq \phi_o(x_o) \geq \ldots \geq \phi_l(x_l) \geq \phi_k(x_k) \geq \phi_i(z_i),$$

and hence at $q := z_j w_s w_t \ldots w_m x_o \ldots x_l x_k z_i z_{-jst\ldots mo\ldots lki}$ we have

$$j \,\mathbf{R}^q\, s \,\mathbf{R}^q\, t \,\mathbf{R}^q \ldots \mathbf{R}^q\, m \,\mathbf{S}^q\, o \,\mathbf{R}^q \ldots \mathbf{R}^q\, l \,\mathbf{R}^q\, \mathbf{R}^q\, k \,\mathbf{R}^q\, i,$$

where every variable interacts with a subsequent one. Hence, as shown previously, we must have $j \,\mathbf{S}^q\, i$, hence $j \,\mathbf{S}^z\, i$, which is a contradiction.

References

D. Bouyssou and T. Marchant. Additive conjoint measurement with ordered categories. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 203(1):195–204, 2010.

D. Bouyssou, T. Marchant, and M. Pirlot. A conjoint measurement approach to the discrete Sugeno integral. *The Mathematics of Preference, Choice and Order*, pages 85–109, 2009.

G. Debreu. Topological methods in cardinal utility theory. *Cowles Foundation Discussion Papers*, 1959.

D. Ellsberg. Risk, ambiguity, and the Savage axioms. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 75(4):643–669, 1961. ISSN 0033-5533.

I. Gilboa. Expected utility with purely subjective non-additive probabilities. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 16(1):65–88, 1987.

M. Grabisch and C. Labreuche. A decade of application of the Choquet and Sugeno integrals in multi-criteria decision aid. *4OR: A Quarterly Journal of Operations Research*, 6(1):1–44, 2008. ISSN 1619-4500.

S. Greco, B. Matarazzo, and R. Słowiński. Axiomatic characterization of a general utility function and its particular cases in terms of conjoint measurement and rough-set decision rules. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 158(2):271–292, 2004. ISSN 0377-2217.

R. L. Keeney and H. Raiffa. *Decisions with multiple objectives: Preferences and value tradeoffs*. Cambridge Univ Pr, 1976. ISBN 0521438837.

V. Köbberling and P. P. Wakker. Preference foundations for nonexpected utility: A generalized and simplified technique. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 28(3):395–423, 2003.

D. H. Krantz, R. D. Luce, P. Suppers, and A. Tversky. Foundation of measurement. vol. 1: Additive and polynomial representations, 1971.

C. Labreuche. An axiomatization of the choquet integral and its utility functions without any commensurability assumption. In S. Greco, B. Bouchon-Meunier, G. Coletti, M. Fedrizzi, B. Matarazzo, and R. R. Yager, editors, *Advances in Computational Intelligence*, volume 300 of *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, pages 258–267. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012. ISBN 978-3-642-31724-8. 10.1007/978-3-642-31724-8_27.

J. Quiggin. A theory of anticipated utility. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 3(4):323–343, 1982.

L. Savage. *The Foundations of Statistics*. Wiley publications in statistics. John Wiley and Sons, 1954.

D. Schmeidler. Subjective probability and expected utility without additivity. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 57(3):571–587, 1989. ISSN 0012-9682.

P. Wakker. Additive representations of preferences, a new foundation of decision analysis; the algebraic approach. In *Mathematical Psychology*, pages 71–87. Springer, 1991a.

P. Wakker. Additive representations on rank-ordered sets. i. the algebraic approach. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 35(4):501–531, 1991b.

P. P. Wakker. *Additive representations of preferences: A new foundation of decision analysis*. Kluwer Academic Publishers Dordrecht, 1989.